

LONDON  
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
FETTER LANE, E C. 4

CHICAGO THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
(AGENTS FOR THE UNITED STATES)  
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS: MACMILLAN  
TOKYO · MARUZEN COMPANY LTD

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

# THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE  
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION*

BY

CHARLES J. SISSON

W. E. COLLINSON

AND

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

VOLUME XXX



CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1935





# CONTENTS

## ARTICLES

	PAGE
BALD, R. C., A Manuscript Work by Sir George Buc . . . . .	1
BETTERIDGE, H. T., The Ossianic Poems in Herder's 'Volkslieder' . . . . .	334
BISSON, S. W., Claude Fauchet's Manuscripts . . . . .	311
BULLOUGH, G., 'The Murder of Gonzago' . . . . .	433
BUTTON, H. G., Gaite de la Tor—An Essay in Interpretation . . . . .	472
CARR, CHARLES T., German Grammars in England in the Nineteenth Century . . . . .	481
CARR, CHARLES T., Notker's Accentuation System in his Translations of Aristotle's 'Categories' and 'De Interpretatione' . . . . .	183
DAVIES, CICELY, Ut Pictura Poesis . . . . .	159
ELLIS-FERMOR, U. M., The Imagery of 'The Revengers Tragedie' and 'The Atheists Tragedie' . . . . .	289
GILLIES, A., A Scottish Correspondent of Wieland's and the Importation of German into Scotland . . . . .	36
MILL, ANNA J., The York Bakers' Play of the Last Supper . . . . .	145
MUIR, LAURENCE, The Influence of the Rolle and Wyclifite Psalters upon the Psalter of the Authorised Version . . . . .	302
PARKER, ALEXANDER A., Notes on the Religious Drama in Mediæval Spain and the Origins of the 'Auto Sacramental' . . . . .	170
PURDIE, E., Professor J. G. Robertson. A Bibliographical Note . . . . .	50
ROSENFELD, SYBIL, The Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660-1700 . . . . .	445
ROTH, CECIL, João Pinto Delgado—A Literary Disentanglement . . . . .	19
SEWELL, ARTHUR, Milton and the Mosaic Law . . . . .	13, 218
TILLEY, ARTHUR, Ronsard's Poetic Growth, II . . . . .	460
WILSON, CLAUDINE I., Francisque Michel and his Scottish Friends . . . . .	26
WOLKEN, F., Gottfried Keller's 'Pankraz der Schmoller' . . . . .	324

## MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

ABERCROMBIE, NIGEL, A Note on a Passage in 'Guigemar' . . . . .	353
CHAMBERS, E. K., Sir Henry Lee's Entertainment of Elizabeth in 1592 . . . . .	218
FIEDLER, H. G., A Letter of Johann Georg Zimmermann . . . . .	59
LEECH, CLIFFORD, Sir Henry Lee's Entertainment of Elizabeth in 1592 . . . . .	52
LEGGE, M. DOMINICA, The Anglo-Norman Sermon of Thomas of Hales . . . . .	212
MACDONALD, ANGUS, 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight', II 14ff . . . . .	343
MENNIE, DUNCAN M., A Note on Goethe as a Translator of English Prose, 1820-1832 . . . . .	61
RABY, F. J. E., A Middle English Paraphrase of John of Hoveden's 'Philomena' and the Text of his 'Viola' . . . . .	339
REDBOND, W. J., The Old English Word 'sætlicas' . . . . .	210
SMITH, G. C. MOORE, Printed Books with Gabriel Harvey's Autograph or MS. notes . . . . .	209
STEWART, GEORGE R., JR., English Geography in Malory's 'Morte D'Arthur' . . . . .	204
STOREY, CHRISTOPHER, Consideration of a Difficult Verse in the 'Vie de Saint Alexis' . . . . .	354
URWIN, KENNETH, Date of the Mystère du Concile de Basle, attributed to Georges Chastelain . . . . .	508
WARD, H. GORDON, An Unpublished Poem on Goethe . . . . .	65
WARNE, F. J., Prester John in Coleridge's 'Kubla Khan' . . . . .	55
WATERHOUSE, G., Schiller's 'Räuber' in England before 1800 . . . . .	355

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES ( <i>contd.</i> ).	PAGE
WEEKLEY, E., Etymology of 'Codlin' . . . . .	211
WHITE, BEATRICE, An Early Tudor Grammarian . . . . .	344
WHITING, B. J., Proverbs in the 'Ancien Riwle' and the 'Recluse' . . . . .	502
WHITING, GEORGE W., Milton and the 'Postscript' . . . . .	506
WRIGHT, HERBERT G., Greene's 'Ridstall Man' . . . . .	347
YOUNG, KARL, The Interpretation of a Passage in 'Hamlet'. . . . .	348

## REVIEWS

Allen, D. C., Francis Meres's Treatise 'Poetrie' (G. C. MOORE SMITH) . . . . .	361
Allen, R. B., Old Icelandic Sources in the English Novel (H. G. WRIGHT) . . . . .	381
Andersson, T., Carlos Maria Ocantos (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . . .	548
Appel, C., Die Singweisen Bernarts von Ventadorn (H. J. CHAYTOR) . . . . .	97
Axiochus of Plato, The, trans. by E. Spenser ed. by F. M. Padelford (B. E. C. DAVIS) . . . . .	519
Balzac, Guez de, Premières lettres, ed. by H. Bibas and K. T. Butler (G. RUDLER) . . . . .	536
Bandy, W. T., Baudelaire judged by his contemporaries (E. STARKIE) . . . . .	393
Bennett, J., Four Metaphysical Poets (C. J. Sisson) . . . . .	374
Blancauert, E., Practische Uitspraakleer van de Nederlandsche Taal (T. WEEVERS) . . . . .	406
Boswell, J., Life of Johnson, ed. by G. B. Hill, revised by L. F. Powell (H. WILLIAMS) . . . . .	375
Brod, M., Heinrich Heine (H. G. ATKINS) . . . . .	397
Bronckart, M., Étude philologique sur la langue, le vocabulaire et le style du chroniqueur Jean de Haynin (M. K. POPE) . . . . .	247
Brown, E. G., Milton's Blindness (B. A. WRIGHT) . . . . .	231
Bullough, G., The Trend of Modern Poetry (JOAN BENNETT) . . . . .	528
Bush, D., Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry (G. D. WILLOCK) . . . . .	228
Callaway, M., The Consecutive Subjunctive in Old English (A. O. BELFOUR) . . . . .	71
Chambers, E. K., The English Folk-Play (ENID WELSFORD) . . . . .	226
Chevalier, M. F., A dramatic adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century (F. J. TANQUERREY) . . . . .	250
Clapton, G. T., Baudelaire the tragic sophist (ENID STARKIE) . . . . .	393
Clyde, W. M., The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press from Caxton to Cromwell (W. W. GREG) . . . . .	513
Coleridge, S. T., Treatise on Method, ed. by A. D. Snyder (E. O. Sisson) . . . . .	379
Companion to Shakespeare Studies, A, ed. by H. Granville-Barker and G. B. Harrison (H. SPENCER) . . . . .	75
Corpus Hamleticum, herausg. von J. Schick, IV (G. C. MOORE SMITH) . . . . .	520
Craig, G. D., The Modernist Trend in Spanish-American Poetry (E. M. WILSON) . . . . .	256
de Selincourt, E., Oxford Lectures on Poetry (L. C. MARTIN) . . . . .	238
Elston, C. S., The Earliest Relations between Celts and Germans (A. O. BELFOUR) . . . . .	262
Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature (EDITH C. BATHO) . . . . .	383
Evans, B. L., English Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century (L. ABER- CROMBIE) . . . . .	237
Exeter Book, The, Part II, ed. by W. S. Mackie (B. COLGRAVE) . . . . .	511
Feuillerat, A., Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman (L. BRANDIN) . . . . .	395
Folie Tristan de Berne, La, ed. by E. Hoepffner (E. VINAVER) . . . . .	533
Foscolo, U., Opere, Edizione Nazionale, VII, VIII (E. R. VINCENT) . . . . .	104

# Contents

vii

REVIEWS ( <i>cont.</i> ).	PAGE
Gibelin, J., <i>L'Esthétique de Schelling et l'Allemagne de Madame de Stael</i> (E. EGGLI) . . . . .	541
Goethe Centenary Papers, University of Chicago, ed. by M. Schütze (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . . . . .	122
Goethe's <i>Faust</i> , The First Part of, trans. by J. Shawcross (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . . . . .	408
Goethe, J. W. von, <i>Faust</i> , Parts One and Two, trans. by G. M. Priest (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . . . . .	408
Goethe, J. W. von, <i>Faust</i> (Part II), Acting Version by G. and T. Rawson (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . . . . .	408
Goethe, <i>The Practical Wisdom of</i> , trans. by F. M. Stawell and N. Purtscher-Wydenbruck (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . . . . .	408
Graham, P. G., <i>The Relation of History to Drama in the Works of Friedrich Hebbel</i> (E. PURDIE) . . . . .	125
Gui de Warewic, ed. by A. Ewert, I, II (A. T. BAKER) . . . . .	529
Hansworth, G., <i>Les 'Novelas Exemplares' de Cervantes en France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle</i> (W. C. ATKINSON) . . . . .	254
Henn, T. R., <i>Longinus and English Criticism</i> (L. SOLOMON) . . . . .	382
Jaberg, K., und J. Jud, <i>Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Sudschweiz</i> , IV (J. ORR) . . . . .	106
Jenkins, T. A., <i>Word-studies in French and English</i> (E. WEEKLEY) . . . . .	240
Jones, P. J., <i>Prologue and Epilogue in Old French Lives of Saints before 1400</i> (A. T. BAKER) . . . . .	245
Knight, A. H. J., <i>Some Aspects of the Life and Work of Nietzsche</i> (B. FAIRLEY) . . . . .	127
Kurtz, B. P., <i>The Pursuit of Death</i> (G. KITCHIN) . . . . .	235
Lancaster, H. C., <i>A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century</i> , II (W. G. MOORE) . . . . .	99
Lea, K. M., <i>Italian Popular Comedy</i> (J. PURVES) . . . . .	364
Leishman, J. B., <i>The Metaphysical Poets</i> (JOAN BENNETT) . . . . .	372
Lemmi, C. W., <i>The Classic Deities in Bacon</i> (H. B. LATHROP) . . . . .	94
<i>Libri commerciali dei Peruzzi</i> , ed. by A. Saponi (C. FOLIGNO) . . . . .	547
Mann, M., <i>Érasme et les Débuts de la Réforme française</i> (A. L. SELLS) . . . . .	249
Marcuse, L., <i>Heinrich Heine</i> (H. G. ATKINS) . . . . .	397
Maren von dem Stricker, herausg. von G. Rosenhagen (C. BATER) . . . . .	121
Marlowe, C., <i>Edward II</i> , ed. by H. B. Charlton and R. D. Waller (M. ECCLES) . . . . .	360
Marston, J., <i>Plays</i> , ed. by H. H. Wood, I. (W. W. GREG) . . . . .	90, 357
Mennie, D. M., <i>Die Personenbeschreibung im hofischen Epos der mhd. Epigonenzeit</i> (F. NORMAN) . . . . .	263
Nangle, B. C., <i>The Monthly Review, First Series: Indexes of Contributors and Articles</i> (F. E. BUDD) . . . . .	525
Notker der Deutsche, <i>Werke</i> , herausg. von E. H. Seibt und T. Stark, I (F. NORMAN) . . . . .	119
Orr, J., <i>French the Third Classic</i> (R. L. G. RITCHIE) . . . . .	102
Pei, M. A., <i>The Language of the Eighth Century Texts in Northern France</i> (R. L. G. RITCHIE) . . . . .	242
Petsch, R., <i>Wesen und Formen der Erzählkunst</i> (W. E. COLLINSON) . . . . .	265
Peyre, H., <i>Bibliographie critique de l'Hellénisme en France de 1843 à 1870</i> (A. L. SELLS) . . . . .	544
Peyre, H., <i>Qu'est-ce que le classicisme?</i> (F. J. TANQUERREY) . . . . .	251
Pfandl, L., <i>Historia de la Literatura Nacional Española en la Edad de Oro</i> (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . . .	113
Phillips, E. M., <i>Philarète Chasles</i> (M. E. I. ROBERTSON) . . . . .	252
Pidal, R. M., <i>Obras</i> , I, II (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . . .	116
Pinto, V. de S., <i>Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan</i> (H. WILLIAMS) . . . . .	229
Plattard, J., <i>François Rabelais</i> (A. L. SELLS) . . . . .	535

REVIEWS ( <i>cont.</i> ).	PAGE
Pope, M. K., <i>From Latin to Modern French</i> (A. EWERT)	385
Pribsch, R. and W. E. Collinson, <i>The German Language</i> (F. NORMAN)	258
Publications of the English Goethe Society, X, ed. by L. A. Willoughby (J. SHAWCROSS)	410
Rabelais, F., <i>The Five Books and Minor Writings</i> , trans. by W. F. Smith, 2nd ed., I (F. J. TANQUEREY)	534
Raby, F. J. E., <i>A History of Secular Latin Poetry</i> (H. E. BUTLER)	219
Rachbauer, M. A., <i>Wolfram von Eschenbach</i> (M. F. RICHEY)	264
Ridley, M. R., <i>Keats' Craftsmanship</i> (F. W. BAXTER)	233
St John of the Cross, <i>Works</i> , trans. by E. A. Peers, I (W. C. ATKINSON)	253
Schurmer, W. F., <i>Der englische Frühhumanismus</i> (B. E. C. DAVIS)	225
Schlauch, M., <i>Romance in Iceland</i> (G. TURVILLE-PETRE)	550
Schneider, E., <i>The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt</i> (J. R. SUTHERLAND)	527
Schrobler, I., <i>Wikingsische und spielmannische Elemente im zweiten Teile des Gudrunliedes</i> (F. NORMAN)	403
Schucking, L. L., <i>Heldenstolz und Würde im Angelsächsischen</i> (A. MACDONALD)	221
Seven Sages of Rome, <i>The</i> , ed. by K. Brunner (D. HAMER)	72
Sherburn, G., <i>The Early Career of Alexander Pope</i> (J. BUTT)	524
Sisson, C. J., <i>The Mythical Sorrows of Shakespeare</i> (H. SPENCER)	363
Smith, A. H., <i>A Description of the Hand-Press in the Department of English at University College, London</i> (J. JOHNSON)	96
Speculum Christiani, ed. by G. Holmstedt (D. HAMER)	512
Spenser, E., <i>Works</i> , Variorum edition, III (W. L. RENWICK)	517
Stein, H., <i>Studies in Spenser's Complaints</i> (W. L. RENWICK)	514
Stephens, G. R., <i>The Knowledge of Greek in England in the Middle Ages</i> (B. E. C. DAVIS)	225
Sternberg, K., <i>Heinrich Heines geistige Gestalt und Welt</i> (H. G. ATKINS)	397
Surrey's Virgill, <i>The Fourth Boke of</i> , ed. by H. Hartman (G. D. WILLCOCK)	73
Susebach, H., <i>Caxton: Tulle of Olde Age</i> (H. B. LATHROP)	359
Sutherland, J. R., <i>The Medium of Poetry</i> (H. S. BENNETT)	95
Tannenbaum, S. A., <i>Shakespearean Scraps and other Elizabethan Fragments</i> (F. S. BOAS)	87
Tavera, F., <i>Le Problème Humain</i> (W. G. MOORE)	98
Trabalza, C. and E. Alodoli, <i>La grammatica degl' Italiani</i> (C. FOLIGNO)	546
Trevelyan, H., <i>The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism</i> (L. A. WILLOUGHBY)	122
Turberville, A. S., <i>Johnson's England</i> (J. R. SUTHERLAND)	377
Valkhoff, M., <i>Étude sur les mots français d'origine néerlandaise</i> (R. L. G. RITCHIE)	390
Vallentin, A., <i>Poet in Exile</i> (H. G. ATKINS)	397
van Roosbroeck, G., <i>Unpublished Poems by Voltaire, Rousseau, etc.</i> (H. BIBAS)	392
Walter, H., <i>Heinrich Heine</i> (H. G. ATKINS)	397
Whiting, B. J., <i>Chaucer's Use of Proverbs</i> (J. P. OAKDEN)	358
Whitney, L., <i>Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century</i> (F. E. BUDD)	526
Wickelgren, F. L., <i>La Mothe Le Vayer: Sa Vie et son Œuvre</i> (A. L. SELLS)	539
Williams, C., <i>Reason and Beauty in the Poetic Mind</i> (J. R. SUTHERLAND)	527
Wilson, J. D., <i>The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' and the Problems of its Transmission</i> (W. W. GREG)	80
Yates, F. A., <i>John Florio</i> (J. D. WILSON)	522
Young, K., <i>The Drama of the Mediæval Church</i> (A. W. REED)	222

SHORT NOTICES

After Shelley, The Letters of T. J. Hogg to Jane Williams, ed. by S. Norman	413
Anuari de l'Oficina romànica de lingüística i literatura, V	132
Behre, F., The Subjunctive in Old English Poetry	129
Birnbaum, J., Die 'Memoirs' um 1700	130
Boas, G., The Happy Beast in French Thought of the Seventeenth Century	271
Candy, H. C. H., Milton: the Individualist in Metre	413
Carmody, F. J., Le Répertoire de l'Opéra-Comique en Vaudevilles de 1708 à 1764	271
Chisholm, A. R., Towards Hérodote	556
Chigés, herausg. von H. Breuer	269
Concise Oxford French Dictionary, The, ed. by M. Abel and Mme Chevalley	555
Cornelia, W. B., Classical Sources of the Nature References in Ronsard's Poetry	132
Dante, Hell, trans. by L. How	557
Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch, 16, ed. by F. Schneider	556
Dream of the Rood, The, ed. by B. Dickens and A. S. C. Ross	551
Elizabethan Plays, ed. by H. Spencer	130
Essays by Divers Hands, XIII, ed. by W. B. Maxwell	554
Galbraith, V. H., An Introduction to the Use of the Public Records	552
Gárate, J. G. de Humboldt	561
Gates, E. J., The Metaphors of Luis de Góngora	273
Grisson, R., Herrscherdämmerung und Deutschlands Erwachen in Wagners 'Ring des Nibelungen'	418
Harder, J. H., Observations on some tendencies of Sentiment and Ethics in Minor Poetry and Essay in the Eighteenth Century	553
Hart, A., Shakespeare and the Homilies	552
Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature, XV, ed. by G. H. Maynadier	131
Hayton, Flor de las ystorias de Orient, ed. by W. R. Long	273
Heseler, M., Studien zur Figur des gracioso bei Lope de Vega und Vorgängern	560
Jones, G., Yr Areithian Pros	129
Judson, A. C., Spenser in Southern Ireland	130
Keil, M., Altislandische Namenwahl	418
Lange, M., Vom Fabliau zu Boccaccio und Chaucer	268
Leavitt, S. E. and C. García-Prada, A Tentative Bibliography of Colombian Literature	274
Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages, II	554
Legouis, E., Short History of English Literature	412
Leopardi, G., Epistolario, ed. by F. Moroncini, I, II	558
Leslie-Melville, R., The Life and Work of Sir John Fielding	553
Lieberman, J. B., Robert Browning and Hebraism	269
Lytelton, E., The Claim of our Mother Tongue	267
McGhee, D., Voltairian Narrative Devices	415
Macgregor, M. E., Amelia Alderson Opie	413
Martino, P., Stendhal, 2nd ed.	555
Massinger, P., The City-Madam, ed. by R. Kirk	553
Montaigne, M. de, Selected Essays, ed. by A. Tilley and A. M. Boase	414
Novelletes Exemplars, ed. by Aramon i Serra	559
Olmes, A., Sprache und Stil der englischen Mystik des Mittelalters	268
Percy, T., Ancient Songs, ed. by D. Nichol Smith	131
Pickering, F. P., Die Sprache der Heidelberger Handschrift von Gottfried von Strassburgs Tristan	275

SHORT NOTICES ( <i>cont.</i> )	PAGE
Poschel, K, Die elsässische Lyrik des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts	275
Reichenbach, G, Studi sulle operette morali di Giacomo Leopardi	358
Reuter, O, On the Development of English Verbs from Latin and French Past Participles	267
Rivera, G., A Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of Ecuador	274
Saintsbury, G, Shakespeare	412
Siebert, J, Der Dichter Tannhauser	133
Snitslaar, L, Sidelights on Robert Browning's 'The Ring and the Book'	414
Spanische Romanzen, ed by L Pfandl	416
Torres-Rioseco, A, and R E Warner, Bibliografía de la Poesía Mexicana	274
Trahard, P., Les Maîtres de la Sensibilité française au XVIII <sup>e</sup> Siècle, IV	272
Wendel, H., Arkadien im Umkreis bukolischer Dichtung	270
Willis, R S, Jr, The Relationship of the Spanish Libro de Alexandre to the Alexandreis of Gautier de Châtillon	272
Wuster, E, Grundzüge der Sprachnormung in der Technik	561
Year's Work in English Studies, The, XIII, ed by F S Boas and M. S Serjeantson	411
Year's Work in Modern Language Studies, The, III, ed by W. J. Entwistle	131

## A MANUSCRIPT WORK BY SIR GEORGE BUC

IN 1927 I was able to report the existence of a large autograph manuscript work, previously unrecorded, by Sir George Buc, James I's Master of the Revels. The note then written<sup>1</sup> was the result of a hasty and rather casual week-end examination, but circumstances have recently allowed me to undertake a much fuller study of it<sup>2</sup>, and the results are here offered as a supplement to Mr Mark Eccles's interesting full-length study of Buc in *Thomas Lodge and Other Elizabethans*.

The full title of the manuscript is *A COMMENTARY / Vpon the New Roulle of Winchester, / Comonly called Liber Domus DEI & / Especially concerning the Baronage, & ancient Nobility of / ENGLAND / TOGETHER WITH A SVPPLEMENT / of other ancient families of this kingdome<sup>3</sup> not mentioned in the sayd Roulle or Book / faithfully gathered out of royall, / & publick archives, roulles, & charters / & out of private evidences, histories, / & other monumente authentick / By George Buc knight one of the gent / of the Kings privy chamber & Mast<sup>r</sup> / of his highnes office of the / REVELLS. / Wherin the Authours chief scope is not to mak exact graduall genealogies but to shew the / originall ancester & first founder of those said noble families [together] w<sup>th</sup> som<sup><</sup> [ & of] their mo<sup><</sup>(re) / segnall posteres, [vntyll this tym] [p<sup><</sup>(r)mary deduction of them to their modern posteres.] / & the stat of them / [sayd noble families <erasure> the perodes,] / & those w<sup>ch</sup> yet contnew & flourish / or els y<sup>e</sup> translations & y<sup>e</sup> period of the said families / [rule] / *Je suis marri que ceux, qui ont basti / les genealogies de maisons Nobles, n'ont / faict recherche des premieres souches. / franc Belleforest. / Añal. de france. lb. 2.* / The title-page is numbered 31, and the pagination is continuous to 816, although there are numerous insertions not only of scraps, but of leaves numbered A, B, etc, to follow the page after which they are inserted. An index of names (with pages unnumbered) concludes the volume.*

At the foot of the title-page in an eighteenth-century hand is the note. 'N.B The small handwriting is that of Roger Hill a Baron of the Exchequer who died 1667 & was buried in y<sup>e</sup> Temple Church.' Hill has added a number of notes in a hand easily distinguishable from Buc's,

<sup>1</sup> *T L S*, March 17, 1927

<sup>2</sup> I am deeply grateful to the owner, Major Gordon Halswell, for a loan of the manuscript extending over several months.

<sup>3</sup> The words not in an italic hand were inserted later above the line.



and a clue to the time of his ownership of the volume is given by the fact that one of these notes (on p. 716) is dated 1661. He seems also to have been responsible for the blazonings which are to be found in the margins, since the descriptions of the various coats of arms for the blazoner to follow are in his handwriting.

The title-page indicates fairly clearly the scope and purpose of the manuscript. Families of baronial standing are dealt with in turn, and those mentioned in Domesday Book occupy by far the greatest part of the volume, those of Saxon descent come first, and then those of Norman. Families which can trace their descent back to the Conquest and achieved peerages at a later date follow next, and the book concludes with notes on families which had risen to importance comparatively recently. Buc's own family is practically the only one included which had not achieved baronial rank. The frequent references to the present representative of a family as 'now living an. 1614' determine the date at which the greater part of the book was written, although when he had reached p. 588 Buc refers to a matter which 'Captain Hilton told me in July last 1614,' and it would seem that by the time he had got that far the year was either ended or ending. The manuscript, however, was constantly revised and added to as fresh information came to hand, and almost every page bears traces of alterations in later ink. A few of the later entries can be dated; for example, Buc notes (on the verso of the subject-index inserted after p. 594) that Sir John Roper was created baron of Teynham in Kent on July 10, 1616, and adds: 'Vulgus vocat eū Baronē de ten M: .i. 10 Mille quia soluit 10 Millia librōrū pro baronatu suo.' On p. 814 he chronicles the rise of Bacon: 'franciscus Bacon miles suūus Angl. Cancellarius regis Jacobi 1617. et creatus est Baro de Verulā ap. Wansted. Julij an. D. 1618,' after which he has added in another ink: 'et postea vicecomes de S. Albani.' Since Bacon did not become Viscount St Albans until 1621 it is clear that this volume remained in Buc's possession until his madness, and that he made entries in it as long as his sanity remained. Unfortunately there is nothing in it to indicate its fate when his property was plundered soon afterwards, and the means by which it passed into the possession of Hill.

In spite of my previous conjecture, the *Commentary* is not to be identified with Buc's lost work, *The Baron, or Magazin of Honor*, although there must have been a close connexion between the two works. In fact, it is possible that *The Baron* was an offshoot of the *Commentary*. On p. 101 Buc wrote. 'I will say no more of this matter here as well bycaus it is needless as also by cause I have written largely therof in my

advertisemēte before Glovers Catalogue, & in my Antiquary MS. sic inscripto,' but later he deleted the sentence from 'advertisemēte' onwards, and wrote 'Baron' above the deleted passage. There is nothing in the *Catalogue of Honour* (generally ascribed by modern librarians to Thomas Milles, who edited the papers of his uncle Robert Glover, Somerset Herald from 1571 to 1588) to suggest that Buc contributed any preliminary matter to the book, so his 'advertisements' must have been manuscript *adversaria*, mostly with reference to the translation of Glover's Latin treatise on *Nobility Political and Civil*, which occupies the first part of the *Catalogue of Honour*. It is likely, then, that part of *The Baron*, at any rate, grew out of comments on Glover, but its relations to the *Commentary* are more conjectural. It has already been noticed that the title-page is numbered 31; there is, however, a subject index which had evidently become detached from the end of the volume and is now inserted after p. 594, and this index contains various references to pages earlier than 31 of which no trace now remains. It contains such items as 'Baronie defined 12. 16. 21. 22.,' 'Writ of summons 18. 24.,' 'Knights fee 16. 22.,' etc. This preliminary matter, one suggests, was either transferred to or enlarged into *The Baron*. Since Buc's *History of Richard III* grew out of *The Baron*, the *Commentary* can thus perhaps claim to be the grandparent of the *History*. It is interesting to note that p. 35b (the verso of the first leaf of an inserted sheet) contains upside down, deleted, and overwritten, a title-page for the *History of Richard III*. Furthermore, another sheet inserted after p. 598, with the pages numbered from 32 to 35 and headlines 'Lib. 1.,' headed 'Genealogia Nob HerBertonū de Wallia,' is obviously from a draft of the *History* itself, and has been added to amplify what Buc had already written on p. 599.

Another reference to *The Baron* occurs on p. 36 of the *Commentary*, where Buc states that 'ther is more reason for me to speak of K. Artur & of his princely family: but I have not onely handled his story in my Baron lib. 4. but also I haue redeemed him & his knights & paladins frō fables & scandales' Another work which may have been incorporated in *The Baron* or may have remained separate is the first of two referred to at the end of the account of the Howard family on p. 50d: 'See more of this family w<sup>th</sup> sundry elegies of them in my book entitles [*sic*] Baronū Genealogia scdū tempora regū in principio: & in Archigenealogico.' There are also several other references to the *Archigenealogicon*, which may perhaps be identical with the *Collections Historical and Genealogical of Sir George Buck, Kt.*, possessed by John Strype and cited by him in his *Life of Aylmer* (1701) at pp. 174 and 332, though Strype's volume

may have been the 'Antiquary MS.' to which Buc also refers (see above). In any case, one cannot doubt the tireless energy with which Buc pursued his antiquarian activities.

A good deal of Buc's work in the *Commentary* is based on printed sources, although he possessed his own manuscript of Domesday Book (p. 110, 'in my copy of Domesday', p. 389, 'the book of Domus dei w<sup>ch</sup> I haue'). He is always careful to cite his authorities, generally in the margin, so that his sources of information are easily followed. He gives constant references to 'Nic. Charles' and 'R. B. Y.' (Robert Brooke, York Herald) and less constantly to 'Ric. St. George Norroy,' and it is clear that he had access to the manuscript collections of these heralds.

From Buc's citations, indeed, one obtains the impression of an enthusiastic band of antiquaries who willingly shared their discoveries with one another. Buc often obtained his information by word of mouth, and often at other times from ancient documents in the collections of his friends. 'Camden viva voce' is often cited, and even more often 'St. Lo Kniveton ex Archivis.' On p. 90 these two are referred to as 'or best Antiquaries'; on p. 255 a statement is accepted because 'Mr Camden avoweth it confidently (who is Ipse dixit),' and on p. 110 Kniveton is referred to as 'or Greatest Reader of Records.' Another archivist, Thomas Talbot, also supplied Buc with information. Buc had known old John Stow, for an assertion is supported by the words (p. 37c) 'as M Jon Stow Oculatus testis affirmd to me Confidently viua voce.' There are references to deeds and charters in the possession of Sir Robert Cotton, of Lord George Chaworth, and of Lord William Howard of Naworth, this last 'an excellent antiquary & Archivist... possessed of many ancient rouses deeds charters &c.' (p. 358), who also supplied Buc with information by word of mouth. Information was also derived 'ex libro MS d Armis NoBB. Cambrię ap. Dö. Jo. Trevor' and 'ex libro MS. d Butterby ap. S. Ed. Coke,' who is elsewhere (p. 418) termed 'the most learned & most courtly lawyer of this kingdom.' Coke, Mr Eccles informs us (p. 443), had been one of Buc's counsel in his lawsuit against the Tylneys, and this victory may perhaps have influenced Buc's opinion.

Two of the most interesting references to authorities, however, take one back to much earlier days when Buc had been on good terms with and was probably a frequent visitor at the house of his cousin Philip Tylney. On p. 82 he states that 'Sir foulk de Oyly was w<sup>th</sup> K. Ric. 1. in the holy land, & is stiled a baron disertly in an ancient Manuscript Romance in Bybliothecca Phī Tilney. ap. Shelley in Suff.' The same

romance is almost certainly referred to in a later discussion (on p. 385) on the origin of the name Latimer:

I haue read the word Latimer vsed in the same sense [viz interpreter] in a M S Romance of K. R. 1 wherin the poet maketh the m<sup>r</sup> of the kings ship (being in the Mediterrane sea) to haile a Dromond or great ship of the Saracens, & ther saith y<sup>t</sup> the Latimar of the sayd Dromend stood vp & mad answer to him &c

However, Buc did not confine himself entirely to manuscript and printed sources or to the conversations of his learned friends. In one place he cites the inscription of a tomb he had seen (p. 328), and in another some old stained glass.

moreover if there be any mor place for coniectures, I verily thinke that ther was in ancient tyme A marshall lord of Kirkton in Holland lincolnshire for in a very ancient wyndow of Glass vpon the North side of the Church ther is a forge painted, & a man standing in the habit of a Smith (whom the french call Mareschal) with his hammer in his hand at the anevill as yf he wer working, & over his head ther is a sheld Partū G & V: & theron a lion rampant Gul. as I remember, & w<sup>ch</sup> I haue taken for the armes of these noble Marshalls aforesayd (pp 77-8 )

Other of Buc's information came to him from conversation with nobles at court, with descendants of various old families whom he had met, or from the talk among friends of the antecedents of people concerning whom Buc was curious. More than one anecdote is introduced with the words 'as I have heard my L. Adm. tell' (pp. 602 and 677). Lord Hunsdon and Sir Robert Carey both supplied him with information about their family (pp 481*d* and 678), and other authorities who are cited include 'Dñs Wotton' (p. 733), 'Sr Tho. Vavasor vi. voce' (p. 237 *bis*) and 'la Mary Vere baroness Willoughby vi. voce' (p. 696). Buc's archaeological interests must have begun in his youth, for he reports the words, told to him when a young man, of 'M<sup>r</sup> Richard douty of Boston a very old gentelman' (p 310); but the strangest of the things remembered from his younger days in East Anglia is the story Sir Thomas Tindale told him:

It seemeth that the Tindales of Norfolk ar descended from a K. of Boheme, for S<sup>r</sup> Tho Tindale of that house being a very old knight told me being then a very yong man that the states & barons of Boheme sent to N. Tindale an ancestor of his to require him to com to Boheme to take vpon him the Kingdome thereof as being the next hyre, & that in token thereof they sent a crown & a scepter & a cloth of Estat & other regall ensignes, & the w<sup>ch</sup> as he told me then wer all to be seen yet at his house in . . . in Norfolk. (p 650.)

Everything that came into Buc's net was kept for future use, as we should perhaps realise more fully if we possessed his lost works on poets and poetry and on the Art of Revels.

One of the longest family histories in the *Commentary* is that of the Bucs, which occupies pp. 775-82. Sir George claimed that he had the blood of both Clothair and Charlemagne in his veins through the female line, and that he was descended from a member of a junior line of the

Counts of Flanders, Walterus de Buc, who came to England in command of Flemish troops sent to help King John against the rebellious barons. The fortunes of the family through the successive centuries are summarised by Mr Eccles (pp. 414–17), and beside the full-length account of his family given by Buc in the *Commentary* there are other references to his ancestry scattered through the book (e.g. pp. 50*b*, 50*c*, 131, 171, 237 *bis*, 325, 594, 723, 773). The last two passages are worth quoting since they help to elaborate Mr Eccles's pedigree, and the second of them shows that Buc could claim kinship with the wife of Bacon's eldest brother:

N Mordant of Turvey in Northäpsh<sup>r</sup> knight married Margaret da. & heyr of N filz lewys ads lewys of Cambridgsh<sup>r</sup> knight & of Margaret da. of S<sup>r</sup> Jon Buck of Yorkshir greatgranfather to S<sup>r</sup> George Buc knight M<sup>r</sup> of the Kings office of the Revells. [Their grandson was] that fatt L Mordant that could not endure the sound of a bagg pipe.

This family of Bures continued in great reputation & opulency in Suffolk vntyll the end of K. H 8. the last hyr male wherof married Joaue the da. of S<sup>r</sup> Jon Buc of Yorkshire my great granfather Their heysr generall wer married to Buttes & to Berrow & to Bacon son & hyr of S<sup>r</sup> Nic Bacon L. Keep all of Suffolk.

At the end of the account of his family Buc not only introduces some previously unknown information concerning his father but gives a brief sketch of his own early career:

Robert Buck was my father. he married Elizab. Petterill.<sup>1</sup> but his other brothers dyed ἀπαίδες.) & he was gent vs her to Tho. Godrkn B of Ely L. Chanc. of Engl. & was at the batayl of Musselburgh. & as I have shewed y<sup>t</sup> the most Noble Howards have ben principall patrons & benefactors to my ancestors so I have found them my exceeding good & favorable lords & in pticular & most especially my L. Charles Howard Erl of Notingham & high Adm. of Engl. whom for more then two yerres I followed as a servant, but he of his most noble goodnes vsed me rather like a frend & kinsman then lik a servant, & in that año mirabili vz 1588 he preferred me to Q. Elizab. my most gracious mistress, who now is in Glory in heaven & shall for her rar vertus above her sex be euer honored vpon the Erth.

Mr Eccles doubts whether Buc was ever at Cambridge (p. 420), but a statement on p. 307 of the *Commentary* makes it clear that he was. 'Cadets ther wer of the Pinqueneyes,' he writes, 'for I remēber that ther was a yong gentilmā of that surnam a scholler in Cābridg in my tym.' Unfortunately, Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses* knows nothing of any Pinqueneys who might have been a contemporary of Buc's, since all record of his admission has been lost along with that of Buc himself. Nevertheless, the possibility that Buc was the author of the various sets of verses signed 'G. B. Cantabrigiensis' mentioned by Mr Eccles on p. 420 cannot be ignored.

Buc has already been seen alluding to his service against the Armada, and it seems likely that he served in the Spanish expedition of the

<sup>1</sup> This sentence is a later insertion.

following year. At any rate, there is one reference to the campaign at p. 246 which would come naturally from one who had taken part in it:

This Will. L. Montchensy was very valiant & active, & served K. Ed. 1. in his warres in Wales, & he & some other noble & valiant English gentelmen were slayn an dñi 1287. at the siege of the Castell of Drosan, by the sodayn fall of a wall w<sup>ch</sup> was vnd<sup>r</sup>mined, & fell befor the tyme appointed as the wall at the Corūna in Spayn dyd vnd<sup>r</sup> the w<sup>ch</sup> many brave English soldiours wer sodainly overwhelmd serving und<sup>r</sup> the comand of S<sup>r</sup> Jon Noreis & S<sup>r</sup> fr. Drake añ Dñi. 1589 sub Elhizab. Regina.

Finally, there is a reference to the visit he made to Spain at the conclusion of the peace when he notes (p. 741) that 'Pickering Wotton dyed in Spayn 1605, when I was last there'

Unfortunately, the *Commentary* yields far less than the Cotton MS of *The History of the Life and Reigne of Richard the Third* in the way of Revels Office notes and scraps. One, concerning the entry of a lost play called *Cupid's festuall*, has already been reported<sup>1</sup>. Another possible Revels Office jotting is in pencil on the back of an inserted slip facing p. 50b. The piece of paper on which it was written has been torn in half, and other writing in ink has been written over the pencil scribble. This fragmentary note is as follows.

scarlet fr coronations  
black for funeralls  
standing off of the K<sup>s</sup> household  
stand by the K at playes & masques & [lme]  
Immediately vnd<sup>r</sup> the K.

Another line follows, which is now illegible except for the words 'the' and 'for,' and the tops of the letters of the next line, above the place at which the original piece of paper was torn across, are just visible. One can only conjecture that this tantalising fragment represents a note by Buc of his duties and privileges as Master of the Revels. There are also two references to the Revels Office in the body of the *Commentary*. On p. 602 Buc relates a passage in history which, in spite of its interest, is not even mentioned by S. R. Gardiner. Speaking of Arthur Plantagenet, Viscount Lisle, the illegitimate son of Edward IV, he writes:

he had by another wife 3. daughters & cohyres. Elizabeth Married to S<sup>r</sup> francis Jobson of Essex, Brigit to S<sup>r</sup> Will. Carden.\* & francis fyrst to N. Basset of devonshire, whos issue . . . Basset frantikely pretended a title to the crown since K. James came & ran away when he had don: but the K. hath most graciously pdoned him & receyved him home agayn. & this francis was after married to N. Monke of Devon.

[side-note] \* My L. Admirall told me y<sup>t</sup> S<sup>r</sup> Tho. Cawarden als Cardon m<sup>r</sup> of the Revells sub H. 8 married one of the da<sup>tes</sup> of Artur Plantag.

<sup>1</sup> *T.L.S.*, March 17, 1927. I was certainly wrong in reading then 'Dausse Rob' as the name of the actor who entered the play, but what the correct reading is I am completely unable to determine, since it is written in Buc's most hasty scribble.

Of the future of his office Buc is also aware, as when he writes (p. 706)

Jon Astly was m<sup>r</sup> of the Jewells to Q. Eliz. father to S<sup>r</sup> Jon Astly now of the Kings pr. chamber, & my successor design'd by the Ks patents in reversion heres of maydston in Kent

Now and then a hint of some interest in contemporary literature peeps out, as when Buc mentions that 'Tho North Kn second son of the first L. North translated Plutarks lues into English & left issu behind him Henry &nc.' (p. 735), or refers to 'S<sup>r</sup> Jon Harrington v<sup>e</sup> noble Translator of Orlando furioso' (p. 717) 'S<sup>r</sup> foulk Grevill kni. & chancellor of the Excheq 1614 & coebls' Buc praised as 'a very noble & wis & learned gentilmā' (p. 698), but it is evident that he thought of him as a statesman and courtier rather than as a poet. Of greater interest are Buc's anecdotes of the author of *The Induction to The Mirror for Magistrates* and his father:

This S<sup>r</sup> Ric Sackeville was a very worldly covetous man & by som men by transposition nicknamed fill-sack: in a serm at his funeral m<sup>r</sup> Nowell dean of Poul used thes words briefly. What hee was (viz an honorable pson &c) & how he lived you all know as well as I. how he dyed I know better then you but when he is now God only knoweth, & neither yee nor I

... This L Trér dyed sodainly & miserably, for when hee had by sute & much labour assembled 24 privy consell's of Estat In the counsell chamb<sup>r</sup> at Whithall to heare the cause of S<sup>r</sup> Jon levonson his adversary, & whom he hated deadly, & then w<sup>th</sup> great vehemency & malice he aggravated all matters of complaints against h<sup>y</sup>: & serching for some new matter of accusation ag. him sodainly his soule was separed from his body, & ther left stark dead año Dni . . .

[side-note] Retulit mihi Dūs Admirallus co. Notinghā

(p. 426.)

The *Commentary* shows that Buc was animated by that spirit of national pride which expressed itself in the chronicle plays of his period and in the works of nearly all of the poets of the Elizabethan era. Some of the achievements of the great soldiers and sailors of his time find an incidental reflection in his pages, but the point on which all the national enthusiasm had converged was for Buc, as for so many of his contemporaries, the late Queen herself. Something of his admiration for Elizabeth is expressed in his account of his own early career, but there is a passage elsewhere in the *Commentary* which must be added to the many praises offered up to Gloriana.

Thus K. Ed. 6. & Q. Mary being deceased w<sup>th</sup>out issu Elizabeth their sister next hyr succeeded in the empir of Engl. franc & Ireland: & now king Artur is com agayn for this is that prince & that heroicall lady that did not onely affect & desire to doo good to hir kingdom & to procure & advanc the flourishing stat therof as king Artur did but also she fully accomplished it: & I doo the rather compar her w<sup>th</sup> K. Art<sup>r</sup> by cause Q. Elizab. was called by Guill. du Bartas Claire Perle du Nord, & by his Enarrator Gabr. Lerneus, Estoile du Nort 1. the north starr, or the Chef starr of the North pole amongst the w<sup>ch</sup> Arcturus hath a principall place (as Higenus sheweth. The words of the said lerneus bee that la Roine d'Angleter Elizabeth servoyoit come de phare, ou Estoyle du Nort a infinis gens, en ce siecle troublé. &c) and she was as constant in hir vertuous resolutions Accusd. of life as y<sup>e</sup> Arcture or North starr. & did in brightnes

of wisdom & of high exploits & in Honor & in fortune & in glory outshine & surpasses all her progenitors & thus much for the Returned K. Artur but yet the better to demonstrat this I will transcribe hether an Elegie w<sup>ch</sup> I caused to be written vpon hir picture w<sup>ch</sup> I haue in my house & prise it aboue all Apelles his works & this it is

Sacratissima virgo Diva Elizabetha regis H<sup>c</sup> 8 filia natu minor<sup>1</sup> Primum Walliæ princeps soleñiter declaratur, deinde Sefissimis R.R.R. patre suo, fratre et sorore regnis, et fatis functis (varias interim fortunæ tumultuantis vices experta) Angliæ franciæ et hiberniæ regina inauguratur, quibus Virginiæ Ostendę et Brielię impia adiecit Nouū portū in Galia Litham in scotia cartagenā sandominacam in America, Insulam S. Jacobi in mari Africano, Penicham, Cascaim, Gades et farum in Hispania expugnavit, Gallos, Hispanos, Italos, Germanos, scotos plurimis p̄luis tā navalibus, quā terrestribus supavit Heroïna augusta magnanima, prudens, docta, pudica, et pia. In thesauri augendi, et expromendi curā imprimis prouida, et sollicita In victu, et somno temperatissima. Justitiæ æqua administratrix, Pacis studiosa, in bello invicta. Parens Patriæ, Mater nutricia ecclesiæ Dei, Cuius delicię, sexus sui Phenix, regū exemplar Terrena Tandem sceptrā cū cælestibus pmutans cum Dño NRo Je. Christo gloriosissimo in cælis diua mōrtalis regnat Ac vbi sub natale Beatissimæ virginis año Dñi 1533 in Mundū ingressa est, sic sub festo Añunciationis eiusdem D. Virginis. año Dñi. 1602 beata hæc virgo ad superos redijt Imperāvit años 44 Vixit 70 Regnum Anglię &c relinquens pacatū et opulentū Quod vidimus testamur Geo Buc, eq. Aur MR Reuellor/.

(pp. 37e-f.)

One can also gather something of Buc's attitude towards the principal courtiers and nobles of his time, although it does not take one long to realise that he is very definitely a partisan. The Howards, who were his patrons, he praises warmly and often, and he repeats in the *Commentary* his high opinions of the Herberts, originally written for the *History of Richard III.* Mr Eccles suggests rather than states (p. 444) that, apart from the backing of the Howards, Buc owed his promotion at court to the influence of the Cecils, and that to obtain the Mastership of the Revels the opposition of the Careys had first to be overcome. Buc's attitude towards these two families as revealed in the *Commentary* is, however, the reverse of what one would expect from such a situation. We have already noticed his acknowledgments to members of the Carey family for information incorporated in his book, George, Lord Carew, though childless, is 'howsoeuer euery way so truly-nobley an accōplished gentelman as his vertues will ppetuate his name & memory,' and Thomas, Lord Scrope of Bolton, the brother-in-law of Lord Hunsdon, is referred to as 'a very truly noble gentelman, & my exceeding good L.' (pp. 328 and 336). Though Buc paid lip service to the Cecils, there can be no doubt of his animosity against them, and it must have gone back at least as far as the downfall of Essex, 'that most famous & most noble erl. . . mad away by the trechery & malice of Rob. Crookback & Walt<sup>r</sup> Rakhell. ἀθεοι. sub Eliz. Rēna<sup>2</sup>' Raleigh at the height of his pride had evidently

<sup>1</sup> Buc's handwriting ends with this word. The rest of the inscription is in a different hand, and has been transcribed for him.

<sup>2</sup> 'Crookback' and 'Rakhell' have been written by Buc over the original 'Cecil' and 'Raleigh' at a later date, the word ἀθεοι was probably added at the same time



offended Buc, who writes 'This P. de Gaveston like to Sr Waltr Raleigh in his high fortüe scorned all the noblemen of Engl' (p. 702). It is in the genealogy of the Cecils that Buc's animosity, however, is most clearly revealed. After tracing them back to an old Welsh family, as the heralds of the period were wont to do, Buc continues with woeful maccuracy but evident malice to trace out the more recent history of the family, and spoils his effect only when he naively reveals the source of his slanders.

David Cecill yonger brother to the foresed Philip Cecill was yoman of the robes sub. H. 7 & w<sup>ch</sup> is y<sup>e</sup> place of a Tailor David Cecill his soñ was a yoman of the Guard to K. H. 8 & kept an yñ in stamford in Northamptonshire. & he or his father purchased the manor of Burghly nei stamford & this last david was father to Willhā Cecill, who was bred in Cambridge in S<sup>t</sup> Jons College & ther he married Mary the da. of Peter Cheek a Taylour in Cambridge, by whom he had Tho. Cecill, now erl of Exeter & thē he cam to Grayes yñ & was a very towardly yong gentilmā. & sone after came to the service of Edward Seymo<sup>r</sup> duk of Som<sup>r</sup>set. who preferred him to K. Ed. 6 & was in good grac during his reign & Q. Mary liked him, but she was so deterred w<sup>th</sup> the prophēcy aforesaid that she would gūe him no entertainment But afterward Q. Elizabeth mad him her principall secretary, & after y<sup>t</sup>, Baron of Burghley & L. high Tresorer of Engl & m<sup>r</sup> of the wards. Kn of v<sup>e</sup> Garter &c. he married for his second wife Mildred on of the da<sup>s</sup> of S<sup>r</sup> Antony Cook of Gyddy hall in Essex by whom he had Rob<sup>t</sup> Cecill, Anne Cecill Countess of Oxf & . . . wif to the heyr apparent of the L. Wentworth & who both died ἀπαύδεις) for Robert Cecill his mothers derling his father laboured vehemently to procure him to bee the Q<sup>s</sup> secretary after the death of S<sup>r</sup> fr. Walsinghā: & by his greatnes made S<sup>r</sup> Chr. Hatton L. Chancellor. Charles L. Howard Admirall of Engl. S<sup>r</sup> Walter Raleigh the Q<sup>s</sup> fauorit &c. (who wer then the greatest men of Authority & credit about the Q.) to be sollicitors & autors to her maiesty for the advancement of his said soñ Robert to the said place of secretary: But the Q. naturally disliked deformed men, & thought them eysores and blemishes of her court, & it was vtterly against her hart to gūe to him any eminent place in Court But yet w<sup>th</sup> great importunityes & cōtinuall sut the foresayd honorable psons preyayed so farr as they gott him to bee of the Q<sup>s</sup>. pri. Counsell & after that in tyme he so insnuated himselfe into the fau<sup>r</sup> of the Q as hee obtayned to be principall secretary, & M<sup>r</sup> of the Wards, & since her māties death he hath ben graced by K James first w<sup>th</sup> the dignity & honor of L Cecill of Essindon in Rutlandsh<sup>r</sup>, then a whil after he was mad Vicēit of Cranbourn in Wiltshire, & lastly erl of Salisbury, & L. high tresurer of Engl &c. of his issue & of his allhance in mariage as also of his brother vide Salisbury et Exeter in Glover.

This genealogy I have contracted out of the large pdigree of Silsilt (a<sup>s</sup> Cecill) sett down by d Powell in the history of Wales. & toward the end wher he was defective) I have supplid those psons out a [sic] book by R. P. & printed beyond the seas. & whern the autour vseth no flattery. (pp. 609-11.)

As one would expect from a partisan of Essex Buc regarded Southampton as 'a wise & a valiant gentilmā & most true to his frend' (sic—p. 722). His account of a favourite of a later date is interesting, for he has nothing but praise for Ker; he is 'very extraordinarily beloued and fauord of o<sup>r</sup> Gr. souerain l. K. James & he is worthy of it, for he is wise & discret & faithfull to his M<sup>r</sup>, & curteous to the English & desirē to do good deds & good offices to all' (p. 746b).

Finally, a number of further extracts are given, partly to show how

Buc commented on contemporary men and events, and partly because some of his incidental notes may contain some scrap of information which will prove to be useful to some other investigator:

that Renowned \*Tho. Cauendish of Suffolk who sailed round about the vast globe of the earth & returned home w<sup>th</sup> great richness & w<sup>ch</sup> continued as long w<sup>th</sup> him as *Sal en agua* as the spanish prover<sup>b</sup> is. & he dyed w<sup>th</sup>out issu having sold befor all his lands & spent all

[side-note] \*all charges born & all adventures deducted he had 40 M l<sup>i</sup> for himself, & w<sup>th</sup>in 2 yeres he was worth nothing Rapnæ nō diu ditant. (p 346.)

S<sup>r</sup> Jon Smith lately decessed & who was one of the most magnanimous & sufficient well qualifed Cavalleros of this Kingdome. & he was sent Embassader into Spayn by Q. Elizabeth & had served against the Turk in Hungary & at Lepanto by sea. & vnd<sup>r</sup> the Emp<sup>r</sup> in Africa &cnc (p. 547)

Mdū y<sup>t</sup> this H. Carey baron of Hunsdon was suter to Q. Elizabeth for the erldom of Wiltshire in the right of his granfather maternall S<sup>r</sup> Tho. Bolen erl of Wiltshire, wherunto S<sup>r</sup> Jo. Sautleger opposed clayming that title to bee mor due to him as soñ & heyr to the elder sister & heyr of T. Butler erl of Wiltshr (vt supra) & he was backed herin by Will. Cecill L. Trēr of Engl. The Q. sayd that shee was the next hyr to S<sup>r</sup> Tho. Bollen erl of Wiltshr her granfather by her mother Q. Añ his eldest Da. & so they were both nonesuted Since y<sup>e</sup> death of the sayd H. l. Hunsdon, George l. Hunsdon his soñ renewed the sayd sute for the erldom of Wiltshir, & took great paynes to seek records & matters of Evidenc to mak for him in that behalf. But Q. Eliz. answered hym that she had denied that sut to his father who was a man of more desert then hee was. S. Rob. Cary Vi: Voce

[side-note] Ge l. Hunsdon claymed to be the next to Q. Elizab. by her mother & therfor praid y<sup>e</sup> K. Ja. y<sup>t</sup> he might have her privat lands & goods. The Crown swalloweth all. (p. 678)

Walter the father of this Infortunate Rob. [Earl of Essex] was L. Deputy of Ireland, & ther poinsd by the praotise of Rob. erl of leic. & Letice Knolles his wife, & whom Leicester then kept & after married) vt fama est (p. 290.)

This erl [of Leicester] had also a naturall soñ called Rob. Dudley by Douglas Howard wydow of the l. Sheffield, to whom he promised mariage &cnc. This Rob. Dudley, km & l. of Knebworth castell &cnc sought to prove himself to be legitimat in the starchäber sed frustra he hath had 3 wives wherof two be living viz. Añ Cavendish sister to Capt Cavendish, dead Mary Lee da. of S<sup>r</sup> Tho. Lee, & Elizab. Sowthwell da. of S<sup>r</sup> Rob. Southwell. w<sup>th</sup> whom he liveth now in Livorn in Tuscany entertayned by the Granduk & hath many children. both by M. Lee & by the El. Sowthwell & he taketh vpon him the stile of erl of Warwik & his wife writeth herself Elizab. Warwick. (p. 692.)

Rob. L. Rich married y<sup>e</sup> La. Penelope D'eureux da. to Walter erl of Essex, & by w<sup>ch</sup> lady this Rob<sup>t</sup>, L. Rich & Charles Blount erl of Devon had many children alternis vicibus for she was a most impudent aduress teste Curia Ecclesiastica wher hir own confession is recorded, & may serve for good Evidence for the Archaccuser at the later day. (p. 729.)

Sr H. Vernon a goodly gentilmā did (vpon my knowledg) claym the barony of Powys, & was a very earnest suter to Q. Elizabeth for her mātes favour therin but hee could not prevayle, whether it were for that it was then held y<sup>t</sup> his mother (by whome he claymed) was a bastard (as M<sup>r</sup> Camden insinuated aboue) or for that he was a man of evill life, & every day mor & mor desbauched, so farr forth as in the end he married Vrsula Tay a coñon & notorious strumpet I know not but hee dyed afterward in the fleet for dett. (pp. 362-3)

Williā L. Compton y<sup>e</sup> eldest sone of H. L. Compton married Elizabeth sole da. & hyr of that miserable rich marchant S<sup>r</sup> Jon Spenser ald<sup>mā</sup> of London. by whom he hath a soñ called Spenser Compton. & lands & goods the devill & all. (p. 737.)

Philp L. Wharton married y<sup>e</sup> La. frances da. to Henry L. Clifford erl of Cūberland by whom he had S<sup>r</sup> George Wharton who slew & was slayn reciprocally of his enemy S<sup>r</sup> James stuard a scotishmā. añ. Di. 1611. (p. 725.)

Jon borough his yonger brother was a very valiant & a wise gentelman He serued in the low countreys vnder the erl of Leicester & was gou'ner of Duisberg he went after to the West Indes & afterward too[k] a great & rich Carick of Spayn & through on fault w<sup>ch</sup> is fatall to all men w<sup>ch</sup> incurr [it] viz contempt of their enemy he was slayn in single fight by a very yong knight who he scornd as a boy & he was killed ner Padington in a feld called Diury Close a fatall name to him & shewed also Gods judgment & Justice vpon him, for he vpon a trifling quarell fought with Sr Willm Durey in france being then both Coronels vnder the L Willoughby at the bataile of Guiney nei S Andrews in Picardy. (p 552)

Ipres y<sup>e</sup> or house in Knightryders street in London now in the possession of one Angel y<sup>e</sup> kings fishmong<sup>r</sup> (p 620.)

R. C. BALD.

EXETER.

## MILTON AND THE MOSAIC LAW

IN *De Doctrina Christiana*, Milton declares unequivocally that the whole of the Mosaic Law, civil as well as ceremonial, was abrogated by the Gospel<sup>1</sup>. His view of regenerate man, involving the autonomy of the individual will and conscience, could tolerate no external prohibition or imperative of Law, whether made by God or man. For the believer, Gospel Liberty is enough and any external discipline, whether exercised by civil magistrates or by the curse of the Law, is an infringement of that liberty. Regenerate man, he thought, is guided by a sufficient and all-embracing inward law, the voice of the Holy Spirit<sup>2</sup>.

The full implications of Gospel Liberty came to Milton only gradually. He had much of his earlier opinion to reject before he broke away from the bondage of 'a servile obedience' and attained the stature of the free man. The last external obligation to be denied by him was the Law, expressly revealed by God and hallowed by ages of ecclesiastical usage. We may read the history of the development of Milton's view of Christian Liberty and the change of his attitude to the Mosaic Law in certain passages in his earlier prose works and in alterations and additions made to the manuscript of *De Doctrina Christiana*<sup>3</sup>.

Milton's more orthodox contemporaries held that the ceremonial Law was completely abrogated by the Gospel, but that the civil Law, the injunctions of the Decalogue, remained binding on all Christians. This view was held by Milton himself, certainly as late as 1644, when he published the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. Speaking there of the irrevocability of God's ordinance, he wrote:

The vigour of his law he could no more remit than the hallowed fire upon his altar could he let go out. The lamps that burned before him might need snuffing, but the light of his law never<sup>4</sup>

Again, in Chapter XII:

Another (shift) while it shall suffice them, that it was not a moral but a judicial law. and so was abrogated. nay, rather not abrogated because judicial: which law the ministry of Christ came not to deal with. And who put it in man's power to exempt where Christ speaks in general of not abrogating 'the least jot or tittle'<sup>5</sup>?

These statements are plain enough.

<sup>1</sup> 'Tota lex Mosaiica aboletur,' *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. Sumner, Cambridge, 1825, p. 303.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapters xxvi and xxvii, *De Doctrina Christiana*.

<sup>3</sup> Now in the Public Record Office, S.P. 9, 63.

<sup>4</sup> Bohn, *Milton's Prose Works*, III, p. 222.

<sup>5</sup> Bohn, III, p. 241.

In the *Judgement of Martin Bucer concerning Divorce*, Milton quotes Bucer's view, which was contrary to his own

We, being free in Christ, are not bound to the civil law of Moses in every circumstance, yet seeing no laws can be more honest, just and wholesome than those which God himself gave who is eternal wisdom and goodness, I see not why Christians, in things which no less appertain to them, ought not to follow the laws of God, rather than those of man. Since we have need of civil laws, and the power of punishing, it will be wisest not to condemn those given by Moses<sup>1</sup>

Bucer's opinion was not orthodox and, although Milton was sufficiently impressed by it to quote this passage from his works, his own view was at the time different. In *Tetrachordon*, published in 1645, speaking of the law of divorce, Milton wrote

It was one of those laws which he forewarned us with protestation, that his mind was not to abrogate: and if we mark the steerage of his words, what course they hold, we may perceive that what he protested not to dissolve was principally concerning the judicial law...for how is that fulfilled longer than the common equity remains in force?<sup>2</sup>

Milton's view in the end was that the whole Mosaic Law was 'fulfilled' so soon as it had been a 'schoolmaster,' sufficient to bring us to Christ.

Finally, when Milton first composed *De Doctrina Christiana*, he had not yet come to the view that the whole of the Law was abrogated. In Chapter x, *De Gubernatione Speciali Hominum*, Milton declares that Christ did not abrogate the civil Law. He agrees that the civil Law may be said 'to have been given on account of the hardness of their (the Israelites') hearts<sup>3</sup>,' but this in no way nullifies it.

Quodcirca Paulus increpat fratres...quod ea (lex forensis) uterentur: nec idcirco abrogatam, neque continuo abrogandam eam esse inde argumentatur<sup>4</sup>.

This statement contradicts the repeated assertions in Chapter xxvii, *De Evangelio*:

tota lex Mosaica aboletur<sup>5</sup>.

We must date Milton's departure from the orthodox view of the Law later than 1659—and, incidentally, for the same reason we shall have to date much of *De Doctrina Christiana* later than 1659. For, in that year, Milton used these words in his *Treatise of the Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes*:

As for civil crimes, and of the outward man, which all are not, no, not of those against the second table, as that of coveting: in them, what power they have, they had from the beginning, long before Moses or the two tables were in being. And whether they be not now as little to be kept by any Christian as they are two legal tables, remains as yet undecided as it is sure they never were yet delivered to the keeping of any Christian magistrate. But of these things, more some other time<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Bohn, III, p. 369.

<sup>2</sup> Bohn, IV, p. 247.

<sup>3</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 303.

<sup>4</sup> Bohn, III, p. 368.

<sup>5</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 176.

<sup>6</sup> Bohn, II, p. 547.

This is a difficult passage. But Milton clearly shows that he is still doubtful whether or not the whole Law is obligatory on Christians. He leaves the matter undecided, promising to discuss it some other time. Had the relevant parts of *De Doctrina Christiana* been written in 1659, Milton's statement—'but of these things, more some other time'—would have been meaningless: for the matter would have been already determined. We may be sure, then, that those passages in the treatise which declare the Law to be completely abrogated by the Gospel were written after 1659.

*De Doctrina Christiana* was never finally revised by Milton, nor did he prepare it for the press. There are references in the earlier chapters to certain points of doctrine which are either repudiated or modified in other parts of the work. Many of these are references to the Mosaic Law: and we may trace from them something of the development of his view. Furthermore, many of the alterations and additions made to the manuscript of the treatise in a later hand concern the application of the Law: and these, too, throw light on the same process. The change involves a more precise definition and a more limited application of the Law.

The view that the Law is totally abrogated by the Gospel has as a corollary the view that the Law was intended for the Israelites alone. Milton was not always of this opinion. The description of the Law now reads:

Lex Mosaica erat multorum praeceptorum, Israelitis duntaxat, scripta institutio . . .<sup>1</sup>. In the manuscript<sup>2</sup>, the word 'duntaxat' is written in the margin, and in the body of the text the word 'potissimum' has been deleted. The paragraph elaborating the significance of the phrase—'Israelitis duntaxat'—has also been written in the margin in a later hand<sup>3</sup>. This paragraph emphasises the importance of the wall of division between the Jews and the Gentiles.

Hic paries intergerimus, ille inter gentes nempe et Israelitis morte Christi tandem dirutus et solutus<sup>4</sup>.

In the same chapter, the division is restated in the sentence<sup>5</sup>.

Hinc omnibus nondum regenitis lex naturae data est, in eundem finem atque data est Israelitis lex Mosaica

This is a marginal substitution for the earlier reading:

Hinc non Judaeis modo sed omnibus etiam non regenitis lex data est, etsi non plane Mosaica<sup>6</sup>.

It is clear that Milton was anxious to reduce the scope of the Mosaic Law

<sup>1</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> MS., p. 308.

<sup>3</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 297.

<sup>4</sup> MS., p. 307

<sup>5</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 296.

<sup>6</sup> MS., p. 309.

as much as he could. The 'ways of God to Man' and the nature of Christian Liberty are more easily apprehensible if we believe that the rigid Law, whether ceremonial or civil, was an external obligation devised only for the Jews.

Milton was also concerned to reduce the rewards of obedience to the Law. His final view held that mere observance of the commands of the Law was no sufficient guarantee of eternal life: in other words, he believed that God does not and cannot hold meritorious works done in the fear of the curse. This had not always been his opinion. In Chapter iv, *De Praedestinatione*, he wrote:

(Scriptura) salutem atque vitam aeternam sub conditione obedientiae in Veteri Testamento, fidei in Novo aequè omnibus proponit<sup>1</sup>.

A little later he modified this statement in a passage that reads very much like an addition to the manuscript from which Daniel Skinner made his fair copy of the first thirteen chapters:

(vix enim est ut de electione propria dicta, id est, ad vitam aeternam, in veteri foedere verbum ullum aut vestigium expressum reperias)<sup>2</sup>

Even this, however, is not his final view. In Chapter xxvi, *De Manifestatione Gratiae*, these words are added to the manuscript in a later hand<sup>3</sup>: and I take these to be Milton's last words on the subject:

littera occidit . vitam aeternam non promisit<sup>4</sup>.

A line further on, this also is added:

Itaque in ipsa Mosi persona imperfectio legis manifesta fuit: Moses enim, qui legis typus erat, non potuit in terram Canaan, id est, in aeternam requiem perducere Israelis filios, sed ductu Josuae, id est, Jesu, ingressus us datus<sup>5</sup>.

The chapter ends with the plain statement—again written in the margin in a later hand—that 'what neither the law nor the observers of the law could attain, faith in God through Christ has attained, and that even to eternal life<sup>6</sup>.'

The Law was an external obligation imposed on the children of Israel 'to the end that they, being led thereby to an acknowledgement of the depravity of mankind, and consequently of their own, might have recourse to the righteousness of the promised Saviour<sup>7</sup>.' With the Gospel, an inner prompting takes the place of this external imperative:

He to His own a Comforter will send . . .  
To guide them in all truth<sup>8</sup>.

This function of the Holy Spirit is made clear in *De Doctrina Christiana*: but certain emendations made in the manuscript seem to show a develop-

<sup>1</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> MS., p. 310.

<sup>3</sup> MS., p. 310. *De Doc.*, p. 298.

<sup>4</sup> Bohn, iv, p. 379.

<sup>5</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 38.

<sup>6</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 298.

<sup>7</sup> Bohn, iv, p. 382. MS., p. 311.

<sup>8</sup> *Paradise Lost*, xii, 487.

ment in Milton's view of the Holy Spirit, parallel with the development of his view of the Law.

In Chapter VI of the treatise, *De Spiritu Sancto*, Milton asserts that revelation has made no unambiguous description of the nature of the Holy Spirit and that no mode of existence is specifically attributed to It<sup>1</sup>.

Milton was for long uncertain what place the Holy Spirit must take in his cosmology. Always more interested in the practical rather than the merely speculative in theology, Milton's final and only clear statement concerns the function rather than the nature of the Third Person of the Trinity. The manuscript tells part of the story of this development.

The alterations and additions made in the manuscript may be noted:

Chapter XXIV the second sentence of the chapter reads. 'Relata ad Patrem et Filium est Unio et Communio in Christo Filio et ad imaginem Christi glorificatio.' After 'Filio,' Milton has placed a caret mark and over the line has inserted the words—'per Spiritum.' These words have been deleted<sup>2</sup>.

Chapter XXVII, p. 315 in the manuscript: the paragraph beginning 'Per Spiritum Sanctum: nempe donum Dei, evangelio peculiare<sup>3</sup>' has been added in the margin.

The first addition and deletion seem to indicate some hesitation of mind in Milton. Had the Holy Spirit any share in that ultimate union with Christ, the fellowship of the Invisible Church? Milton seems first to have thought not: then to have changed his mind: and, in the end, to have decided not. When he finally deleted 'per Spiritum' in this context, he surely had in mind the restriction of the Holy Spirit's functions, implied in the words—'evangelio peculiare.' Christ is the supreme Mediator and in Milton's belief we need no other. The Holy Spirit, whose function is similar but far superior to that of the Law, is a teacher whose authority, unlike that of the Law, is the very excellence of His teaching. This view is complementary to Milton's final view of the Mosaic Law: for the Holy Spirit wholly takes the place of the Law which is wholly abrogated.

I have pointed out elsewhere<sup>4</sup> that certain of Milton's theological views were not finally determined when *Paradise Lost* was written. His view of the Law seems, however, to have been fully developed when he composed Book XII of the poem—the book in which all the relevant passages occur. Certain of Milton's second thoughts on the Law are to be found in this book, and the wording of the verse seems to show that it was based on a corresponding passage in *De Doctrina Christiana*. There are

<sup>1</sup> *De Doctrina Christiana*, Chapter VI, passim

<sup>2</sup> MS., p. 287

<sup>3</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 301.

<sup>4</sup> See my essay on the Composition of *De Doctrina Christiana* *Essays and Studies*, 1934.



two clear instances of this. In Book XII, Michael tells Adam of the promised Saviour.

The Woman's Seed—*obscurely* then foretold,  
Now *amplier* known thy Saviour and thy Lord<sup>1</sup>.

In *De Doctrina Christiana*, Chapter XXVII, *De Evangelio*, Milton describes the Gospel as

nova dispensatio foederis gratiae. primum a Mose et prophetis *obscurius*, deinde ab ipso Christo. . . *plena luce* annuntiata<sup>2</sup>.

The words 'obscurius' and 'plena luce' are additions to the manuscript in a later hand.

Earlier in the same book, we read:

And therefore shall not Moses, though of God  
Highly beloved, being but the minister  
Of Law, his people into Canaan lead,  
But Joshua, whom the Gentiles Jesus call,  
His name and office bearing who shall quell  
The Adversary Serpent, and bring back  
Through the world's wilderness long-wandered Man  
Safe to eternal Paradise of rest<sup>3</sup>.

This certainly seems to be based on the passage already quoted from the treatise:

Itaque in ipsa Mosis persona imperfectio legis manifesta fuit: Moses enim, qui legis typus erat, non potuit in terram Canaan, etc.<sup>4</sup>

This passage is also an addition to the manuscript in a later hand.

Milton's final view of the Law was, therefore, determined after 1659—for in that year he wrote that the question 'remains as yet undecided'<sup>5</sup>—and before 1666, the year in which he finished the composition of *Paradise Lost*. The phrase—'tota lex Mosaica aboletur'—is in the body of (i.e., not an addition to) the manuscript<sup>6</sup>. I conclude that the chapter containing this sentence, Chapter XXVII, was written after 1659 and that many of the additions to and revisions of *De Doctrina Christiana* were made in the years chiefly occupied by the composition of the poem. Milton had much leisure in those years, for Edward Phillips tells us that 'in all the years he was about this Poem, he may be said to have spent but half his time therein'. The manuscript of *De Doctrina Christiana* gives us a hint, perhaps, of Milton's occupation from the Vernal Equinoctial to the Autumnal<sup>8</sup>.

ARTHUR SEWELL.

AUCKLAND, N.Z.

<sup>1</sup> *Paradise Lost*, XII, 543.

<sup>2</sup> MS, p. 312.

<sup>3</sup> *Paradise Lost*, XII, 307.

<sup>4</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 298. MS, p. 310.

<sup>5</sup> Bohn, II, p. 547.

<sup>6</sup> *De Doc.*, p. 303.

<sup>7</sup> *Early Lives of Milton*, ed. Darbishire, p. 73.

<sup>8</sup> A more thorough examination of the manuscript than I have had opportunity to make should throw light on the order in which the chapters were written. Unfortunately, the first thirteen chapters were neatly copied by Daniel Skinner, and of the composition of these the manuscript tells no tale.

## JOÃO PINTO DELGADO—A LITERARY DISENTANGLEMENT

Del Poema de Hester en sacro coro  
Mosseh Delgado da esplendor sonoro,  
Y corren con su voz en ricas plantas  
De Jeremias las Endechas santas.

(Miguel de Barrios, *Relacion de los Poetas*, p. 54 )

PERHAPS the most gifted of that illustrious band of Spanish writers who worked in exile during the heyday of the Inquisition was Juan (or João) Pinto Delgado. He is remembered, indeed, only for one book: *Poema de la Reyna Ester, Lamentaciones del Propheta Jeremias, Historia de Rut, y Varas Poesias*, which appeared at Rouen in 1627. Notwithstanding the slenderness of his output, he ranks high among the poets of his generation. Ticknor, Amador de los Ríos, even Menéndez y Pelayo (whose literary judgments are so often biased by theological prejudices) vie with one another in their praise of his genius: and there are not many of his exiled contemporaries about whom so much has been written.

It was long imagined that the work by which this author is known must have been a posthumous one: for the little known about his life referred to the sixteenth century. According to the current works of reference<sup>1</sup>, João Pinto Delgado had been born at Tavira, in Portugal, about 1530. Going in his youth to Spain, he studied the humanities at Salamanca, where he became friendly with the poet Luis de León. He was famous not only for his poetical gifts, but also for his prodigious memory. However, owing to the persecutions of the Inquisition (for he was of New Christian stock, and *ipso facto* suspect), he left his native country and made his way first to Italy and then to France. It was here that he carried out the greater part of his literary work, and here presumably that he died, in 1591.

Doubt was thrown upon this story for the first time by Sousa Viterbo, in a separate study devoted to the subject<sup>2</sup>. In this, he proved from

<sup>1</sup> Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*, II, pp. 393, 722, amplified by Kayserling, *Sephardim*, p. 153 sqq. Both of these writers, unfortunately, omit to quote authority for their statements. Cf. also J. Amador de los Ríos, *Estudios sobre los Judíos de España*, p. 500 sqq., Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles*, II, pp. 606-7, A. de Castro, *Historia de los Judíos en España*, p. 195, Ticknor, *Spanish Literature*, II, p. 46, Maximiano Lemos, *Zacuto Lusitano a sua vida e a sua obra* (Oporto, 1909), pp. 246-50. Kayserling's article in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, IV, p. 504, adds nothing fresh, though it appears to state as facts certain details which appear in the same author's *Sephardim* as hypotheses: that in the new *Encyclopædia Judaica*, V, p. 910, as usual, ingenuously follows the last-named compendium.

<sup>2</sup> 'João Pinto Delgado' in *O Instituto*, XLIII (1896), p. 857 sqq.: also published separately, Coimbra, 1897, 15 pp.

documentary sources that, while a certain João Pinto Delgado indubitably died about the year mentioned, another person of the same name was appointed *almoxarife* of Mazagão in 1602 in consideration of his having been in the royal service as man-at-arms for seven years, and was still holding the same appointment in 1607. The latter is very much more likely to have been the author of the volume published at Rouen in 1627 than his homonym who died thirty-seven years previous to that date. The question is further complicated by the fact that there existed contemporaneously another Portuguese poet who bore the same surname, and came from the same part of the country. This was Gonçalo Pinto Delgado, *escrivão dos orfãos* at Tavira, who in 1596 commemorated the English raid on Faro in a characteristic effusion *Poema composto de que era o argumento: A violenta irrupção feita pelos Inglezes no anno do 1596, saqueando e abrazando a cidade de Faro*<sup>1</sup> From the documents discovered by Sousa Viterbo, it is all but certain (though he does not mention the fact) that this poet was a son of the earlier João Pinto Delgado, to whose official position he succeeded on his death.

From a contemporary record, hitherto unknown, it is now possible to throw some new light upon Gonçalo's personality and activities.

On November 8, 1585, a youth named Balthazar da Costa, newly returned from Flanders, appeared before the Inquisitional Tribunal at Lisbon and gave detailed information with regard to those Portuguese of suspected orthodoxy with whom he had intermingled while he was living in Antwerp some time previous. In the course of his deposition, the following passage occurs:

And he further saith that about three years ago or thereabouts, this confessant being in Antwerp, as he has said before, he had a conversation with Gonçalo Delgade, new Christian, an unmarried youth, son of one Joam Pinto of Algarve. He does not know for certain in which town he resides, but he thinks it is Villa Nova, and confessant has heard say that he has some office in the Custom House, and is a great troubadour, and that because of his ability the King conferred one or two offices on him; the which Gonçalo Delgade was in Antwerp living at his uncle's house, a merchant, whose name he cannot remember; and during the course of a year confessant had conversations with this Gonçalo Delgade who told him on various occasions that he was a Jew, and confessant said the same of himself, and as such they knew one another<sup>2</sup>.

The details given in this denunciation leave little room for doubt that the accused person is identical with the litterateur from Tavira, in Algarve, who has been mentioned above. His father was plainly a poet of some

<sup>1</sup> *s.l.n.d.* Barbosa Machado, *Biblioteca Lusitana*, II, p. 393 This work is dedicated to Ruy Lourenço de Tavora.

<sup>2</sup> Arquivo da Torre do Tombo, Lisbon: *Inquisição de Lisboa*, proc. 5341. A précis of this deposition is given in Baião, *A Inquisição em Portugal e no Brasil*, p. 213. This, however, gives the impression that the phrase 'a great troubadour,' etc., refers to the son, not the father.

attainments, to judge from the phrase *grande trovador*. None of his work, indeed, is known. His reputation, on the other hand, seems to have survived him. This fact is presumably responsible for the blunder made by Barbosa Machado, who, having heard of his literary ability, imagined that he was the author of the volume of poems published a generation after his death<sup>1</sup>. The 'one or two offices' referred to in the text seem to allude to his nomination as Purveyor of building materials at Mazagão in 1578, some four or five years previous<sup>2</sup>.

A couple of years after this denunciation, Gonçalo Pinto Delgado was back in Portugal, where he succeeded to his father's position in 1590—the year of the latter's death. He was still resident at Tavira, as *escrivão dos orfãos*, in 1596, when he wrote his poem in celebration of the English raid on Faro. The famous João Pinto Delgado (as will be shown below) was not his father, but his son. It is possible, though not quite certain, that the latter was identical with the person appointed *almoxarife* of Mazagão in 1602, in which case he must have begun his active life at a very early age. In 1616, he was still in Portugal, contributing an introductory sonnet to João Baptista de Este's *Consolação christã e Luz para o povo Hebreo sobre os Psalmos do Real Profeta David . . . declarado no sentido litteral*<sup>3</sup>—his only known publication in Portuguese, though that was presumably his native tongue.

Not long after this, the family finally left the Peninsula. A decade later, the *Poema de la Reyna Ester* was published at Rouen and within a year or two we find both Gonçalo and João Pinto Delgado figuring prominently in a glamorous episode in the same city, the records concerning which permit a final solution of the literary mystery with which we are here concerned.

There was at this time settled at Rouen a considerable colony of merchants from Spain and Portugal. A very large proportion of it—as of all other settlements of the sort—was composed of Marranos, or New Christians: descendants, that is, of those Jews who had been forcibly converted to Christianity in Spain and Portugal many generations before, but still maintained in the privacy of their homes their fidelity to the faith of their fathers<sup>4</sup>. The nucleus at Rouen was at this time one of the most important in France, second only to those at Bordeaux and Bayonne.

<sup>1</sup> Possibly João Pinto Delgado I was the author of the Portuguese translation of Petrarch to which Barbosa Machado refers.

<sup>2</sup> Sousa Viterbo, *ubi supra*.

<sup>3</sup> Lisbon, Pedro Craesbeek, 1616. The fact of contributing commendatory verses to a work of this description is not necessarily a proof of orthodoxy. It may have been sheer camouflage.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. my *History of the Marranos* (London and Philadelphia, 1932).

## 22 *João Pinto Delgado—A Literary Disentanglement*

A contemporary document gives a minute description of its life and of the persons who composed it and among these the family which concerns us here takes a prominent part. It is as well to allow the deponent (Pierre d'Acarie, Judge of the Ecclesiastical Court) to use his own words<sup>1</sup>

I have diligently enquired concerning the life, practices, and religion of Gonsalvus del Gado, and of John Pinto del Gado, his son. The following is the evidence which I have received from persons worthy of trust, true Christians and Catholics, both Spanish and Portuguese:

'Gonsalvus del Gado and his son, John Pinto del Gado, never lived in the parish of St. Stephen des Tonneliers of this city, but for many years in the parish of St. Vincent, and afterwards in that of St. Egidius . . . John Pinto has another brother at Hamburg, who is there publicly circumcised and is a Rabbi or a Doctor of the Jewish Law. He also lived in this city for some years, under the name Diego Pinto. At this time, he informed a trustworthy person that he had been educated in the Jewish religion by his father, Gonsalvo. This same John Pinto, by reason of his Jewish perfidy, has disputed with certain Spanish and Portuguese Catholics. He used to assert that our Lord Jesus Christ could not be both God and man, to deny the Trinity, and to practise the ceremonies of the Law. He studied the Hebrew language here diligently with two Rabbis, and used to communicate by letter with the Rabbis of Venice and other synagogues. Catholics living here, both Spanish and Portuguese, all considered him to be a Rabbi and Minister of the Jewish religion. Indeed he endeavoured to persuade the Portuguese who came to this city to become converted from the faith of Christ to the Jewish perfidy. By reason of his arts and pestilential teaching, certain of them denied Christ, and through his work some fled to the synagogues of Holland and of Hamburg, where they might profess Judaism more freely and completely. More especially, there was a certain Elizabeth Pereira, whom he sent, with her three elder children, to Hamburg 'to serve God purely' as he put it. . . . The Catholics here suspected him to be circumcised, because the Judasers always invited him to their marriages and funerals. When Mantua was stormed [in 1630], he collected much money on behalf of the Jewish fugitives. The sums collected he gave to those from Holland, Leghorn, Venice, and other synagogues who passed through this place. . . .'

On the basis of this testimony, it is possible to disentangle finally the confusion which has hitherto ruled concerning the Pinto Delgado family, and more particularly the career of its most famous member, João. There seem to have been two persons in the family who bore the name, grandfather and grandson respectively. The former is apparently identical with the worthy from Tavira who flourished between 1530 and 1591, and whose career is outlined in the standard works of reference. His son, Gonçalo Pinto Delgado (the relationship is made plain by the deposition of Balthazar da Costa), must have been born about 1560. He left Portugal in his youth, and lived for some time in Antwerp. Subsequently, he returned to Portugal, where he was to be found from 1588 onwards. Early in the following century he settled in Rouen, where he professed Judaism semi-overtly.

His son, João Pinto Delgado II (born after 1582), was the famous man of letters. In view of the fact that he spent so large a proportion of his life

<sup>1</sup> Royal Archives at Brussels, Office Fiscal de Brabant, liasse 924 bis. The original is in dog-latin.

outside the Peninsula, it is a little surprising that his command of Spanish was so perfect. It is, however, out of the question that the *Poema de la Reyna Ester* was in fact a posthumous work of his grandfather and homonym: for another source provides us with definite proof of the fact that the poet flourished in the seventeenth and not the sixteenth century. Among the commendatory verses prefixed to the first volume of the medical works of Zacutus Lusitanus, the famous Portuguese physician (*alias* Manoel Alvares), which appeared between 1636 and 1638, there is a poem by the author's friend, João Pinto Delgado (*In observantiae et amoris gratiam scribebat amicissimus et perdoctus Joannes Pintus Delgado*<sup>1</sup>). The poet and the physician were therefore contemporaries, and the former must be identical with the doughty religious propagandist, who was living about this time at Rouen—the same city at which the poems were published. The dedication of the work to the Cardinal Richelieu is thus plainly from the hand of the author and not, as had previously been the inevitable conclusion, from that of the editor. Under these circumstances it is no longer necessary to imagine (as is hinted by some earlier authorities<sup>2</sup>) that the work in question must have been a re-issue of an earlier edition—issued presumably some thirty or forty years before.

With regard to the poet's life at Rouen, a good deal that is new may now be added. Notwithstanding their suspected orthodoxy (concerning which we have seen such intimate details above), he and his father played a prominent part in the municipal life of the city, occupying important places in the judicature and the civic administration<sup>3</sup>. In the foreign mercantile colony, they were figures of first importance. Outwardly, they were careful to preserve the mask of orthodoxy, being well known to the curés of the parishes of St Vincent and St Égide and punctilious in their religious observances. In 1632, however, a fierce quarrel broke out in the Spanish and Portuguese colony of Rouen. The details do not concern us here<sup>4</sup>. The upshot of it was, however, that one section was denounced to the authorities as Judaizers by the other (whose own orthodoxy was, as a matter of fact, by no means above question). João Pinto Delgado and his father of course belonged to the former group, being specifically mentioned as their head in all the official depositions.

<sup>1</sup> Maximiano Lemos, *Zacuto Lusitano a sua vida e a sua obra* (Oporto, 1909), pp. 246–50.

<sup>2</sup> J. Amador de los Ríos, *ubi supra*, A. de Castro, *Historia de los Judíos en España*, p. 195.

<sup>3</sup> Brussels, Royal Archives, Office Fiscal de Brabant, 924 bis.

<sup>4</sup> I have described the story in detail in a fully documented study based on the Archives of Brussels and of Lisbon: 'Les Marranes à Rouen: un chapitre ignoré de l'histoire des Juifs de France,' conveniently buried in the *Revue des Études Juives*, 1929, pp. 114–55. Reference may be had to this for original text of many of the documents upon which the present study is based.

Under the circumstances, the authorities had no alternative but to commence proceedings. The colony was thrown into consternation for the penalty for apostasy from Christianity even in France, might well be death. The family which had notoriously taken the lead in all heretical activities plainly stood in the greatest danger. João Pinto Delgado paid a flying visit to Paris, with his wife, to see whether anything could be done. Failing in this, they made their way to Antwerp. Here they were joined by the rest of the family. Not long after, a junior member returned secretly to Rouen, where he destroyed a number of letters and papers which might have provided dangerous evidence. He did not perform his task very thoroughly, however, for, during the course of the subsequent perquisitions, a scroll of the Law, in Hebrew, was actually discovered in the house.

Meanwhile, half of the Rouen suspects had sought safety in flight. the others were transferred under arrest to Paris. Here they brought counter-charges against their enemies to precisely the same effect as those levelled against themselves—viz. of dubious orthodoxy and secret fidelity to Judaism. This was backed up by ecclesiastical certificates testifying to their own impeccability, fortified no doubt by gifts of money. Finally, as the result of the payment of an enormous bribe to the authorities, they were released, and the Marrano colony at Rouen knew another brief period of prosperity<sup>1</sup>.

A number of the fugitives returned and re-established themselves—among them Gonçalo Pinto Delgado, who continued resident there for a few years. His more distinguished son, however, preferred to remain in his new home in Antwerp—still under the disguise of Catholicism. As a matter of course, he and other members of the family sent to Rouen asking the curé of their former parish, St Étienne des Tonneliers, for a certificate of orthodoxy and good behaviour from the religious point of view. This he had little difficulty in obtaining<sup>2</sup>. The Vicar-General of the diocese, however, was not satisfied, and wrote to Pierre d'Acarie, Judge of the Ecclesiastical Court of Rouen, for further details. We have already seen to what effect the latter replied. To his letter, he added copies of all the principal documents in the case: and it is to this accident that the

<sup>1</sup> Among its most important members in the following period was Antonio Enriquez Gomez [Enrique Enriquez de Paz], the famous playwright, and his son Diego Basurto, and above all Manuel Fernandes Villareal, Portuguese Consul-General in France, a prolific writer, and one of the most eminent of all victims of the Inquisition. Cf. Ramos Coelho, 'Manuel Fernandes Villareal e o seu processo,' in *O Occidente*, 1894 (also published separately), and Ribeiro Guimarães in his *Summario de varra historia*, vol. v.

<sup>2</sup> The actual document, as yet unpublished, is in the Royal Archives at Brussels, Office Fiscal de Brabant, liasse 924 bis.

story of this whole astounding episode, forgotten for three centuries, is now able to be reconstructed. It seems that João Pinto Delgado subsequently became known publicly as a Jew, for he is referred to by Miguel de Barrios by his Jewish name of Moses<sup>1</sup>, and the surname of Delgado has since been a common one in the communities of London and of Amsterdam. Yet his writings, though so deeply coloured by the Old Testament, are by no means limited in their interest. The circumstances of their publication, in a land in which Judaism was still a proscribed faith, and with a dedication to a Prince of the Church, saved them, of course, from too obvious a bias. But, in any case, João Pinto Delgado was too great a poet to be narrowly sectarian. His intense sincerity, his depth of feeling, his rich imagery, his grace, his versatility, his perfect command of language, rank him high among the writers of his age. His source of inspiration, on the other hand, introduces into Spanish literature a touch reminiscent of the English poets of the period—of George Herbert or of John Donne—who found in the Bible a fount, not only of religious comfort, but also of poetic inspiration.

CECIL ROTH.

LONDON.

<sup>1</sup> *Relacion de los Poetas*, etc (Amsterdam, 1683), p. 54.



## FRANCISQUE MICHEL AND HIS SCOTTISH FRIENDS<sup>1</sup>

NEARLY a century ago there arrived in Edinburgh on a mission from the Ministère de l'Instruction Publique a young Frenchman, Francisque Michel. He had already spent two years in England (1833-5), investigating on behalf of Guizot's Historical Commission the MSS relating to early French literature and history preserved in British libraries. On this his second mission in 1837, after spending the month of June in London, he travelled northward via Durham, Sunderland and Newcastle to Edinburgh, where he spent a month. His official report to the Minister here for once strikes a personal note, with the comment: 'Je quittai cette ville à regret.' It was then that he made the acquaintance of David Laing, the Edinburgh antiquary and librarian, with whom he was to conduct a correspondence extending over forty years<sup>2</sup>. An excursion to Glasgow completed his exploration of Scotland for the time being. Short though his stay in the country had been, it had sufficed to lay the foundations of an affection for Scotland which lasted all his life.

Between this maiden voyage and his next visit, the first of a long series, many years were to elapse. When he returned, it was after some eighteen years of an academic and scholarly career, as Professor of Comparative Literature in the University of Bordeaux. He may have revisited Scotland in the autumn of 1855, for he wrote to a friend that he intended to do so. The following summer, on the invitation of English friends, he set out to attend the Archaeological Congress in Edinburgh, obtaining from the Minister of Public Instruction permission to consider the journey as an official mission. After a week in London he reached Edinburgh on July 20, in time for the meetings of the Congress which began on July 22 and lasted a week. He reported to the Minister that although 'j'ose dire que j'entends parfaitement l'anglais et même l'écossais,' he found it impossible to take running notes of the proceedings: 'on entrait, on sortait, on me présentait du monde, il fallait serrer la main à des connaissances: le moyen, après cela, de suivre la discussion avec toute l'attention nécessaire.' He spent some three weeks in Scotland, during which he came

<sup>1</sup> This article forms part of a fuller account of Michel's relations with Great Britain, to appear in the *Revue de Littérature Comparée*.

<sup>2</sup> Michel's letters to Laing have been largely drawn upon for the present article. They number 116 and are preserved among Laing's papers in the Edinburgh University Library. The last is dated, from Paris, July 26, 1878. Laing died in October of that year.

and went between Edinburgh, Glasgow and Kelso, and endeavoured to visit the Duke of Hamilton's seat, unsuccessfully, because the Duke was absent. Then he turned southwards once more.

This visit was followed by others, in 1859, in each year from 1862 to 1866, in 1869, 1870, 1872, 1874, 1877, and possibly between and after these dates. A detailed account of his sojournings would be tedious. Their bare enumeration is sufficient to show him as perennially attracted to Scotland.

The interval between his initial visit in 1837 and his later ones is punctuated, in his letters to David Laing, by many protestations of his longing to revisit the land 'cette terre de loyauté et de savoir,' which had he not been born a Frenchman, he would, he says, have chosen for his mother-country. His heart warmed to the tartan with a fervour equal to that of any Scoto-American. He ordered for his bride a tartan shawl, though with the prudent stipulation that its bright hues should be such as would not attract unwelcome attention in the streets of Bordeaux. And many years later, when the long childless couple were the fond parents of a boy aged three, he sent to Scotland for a length of tartan to fit out their little Roland in the garb of old Gaul.

His first enthusiasm was no doubt in part 'literary.' For Michel's Parisian friends in Romantic circles Scotland was a land of glamour and romance; the Highlands were 'de hauts lieux de la poésie,' and Sir Walter was in very truth the wizard of the North, chief priest in the new cult of the Romantic Past. In that cult there were two forms of adoration: the imaginative sympathy of the artist and the reconstructive labours of the scholar. Michel had tried both and he had finally chosen the latter. But, here too, Sir Walter was among the prophets, being a renowned antiquarian and a competent editor of early texts. Michel claimed to be a disciple and friend. He had boasted of this friendship in a note to the preface of his *Havelok*, and would allude to it while in Edinburgh in 1837. Sir Walter having then been dead for five years, there was none to say whether the crowd of excited and gesticulating visitors to his Paris hotel in 1826 did or did not contain a youth of seventeen called Francisque Michel.

The fame of Scott had made the pilgrimage to Scotland a commonplace of travel. Nodier and Vigny, among Michel's early friends, had undertaken the pious journey to Abbotsford in Scott's lifetime. Michel himself was careful, if not to undertake it in his turn, at least to purchase views of Abbotsford and of the grave at Dryburgh and to acquire an autograph.

Scotland, Land of Romance, was also, to the cultivated European, the Land of Hospitality. The Fergus MacIvors and the Rob Roys of 'Romantic' Scotland had embodied the legendary fame of 'l'hospitalité écossaise,' 'die schottische Gastfreundlichkeit.' But the Laird of Abbotsford's open-handed hospitality to countless pilgrims supported fiction with fact, which, moreover, was confirmed by contact with the population generally. Michel experienced Scottish hospitality—and gratefully acknowledged its reality—both at Portobello as the guest of David Laing and elsewhere.

The 'Auld Alliance' between Scotland and France evokes to this day a surprisingly general response, on the Scottish side at least. That Tory romanticism, that deep and living sense of the past, which flashed into genius in Walter Scott, is endemic in his fellow-countrymen. It made to Michel in 1837 an irresistible appeal. He found in Edinburgh scholars who were interested in the history of the relations between the two countries, and, before the end of his first visit, he had resolved to clear up by thorough research certain aspects of the Franco-Scottish connexion, in particular to investigate the records of Scottish students at the University of Paris and of the Scottish Archer Guard at the French court. These investigations, ever extending in scope, eventually resulted in the exhaustive compilation *Les Écossais en France, les Français en Ecosse*, published five and twenty years later.

That monument of industrious research, unrelieved by any grace of literary presentment, was unquestionably inspired by real enthusiasm for the subject, and based on prolonged and painstaking investigation of sources. But a labour of love is not necessarily successful. Before the vastness of this task a scholar of even Michel's uncommon tenacity might have quailed. He was fired by the sentimental appeal of the subject, and sustained by the noble ambition of producing a work not unworthy of it. But those of his Scottish friends who were competent to judge considered that he had undertaken more than he could successfully accomplish. By 1852 he was already hopeful of beginning on the redaction. But six years later, Turnbull, to whom he showed his notes, remarked that 'he only begins to perceive what a task he has set himself and talks of *three* volumes, while the materials would form nearer thirteen.' Yet though his courage at times failed him and he was more than once on the point of abandoning his enterprise, he persevered in his effort towards producing a masterpiece, something higher than mere compilation: 'Je ne veux pas me borner à publier à la queue les uns des autres, les documents, les extraits que j'ai rassemblés; je veux encore les digérer et en faire un tout

suivi qui excite l'intérêt et la curiosité, sans engendrer l'ennui.' That is unhappily just what he failed to do. Turnbull had feared that all the labour would end in 'a strange farrago' Reviewers were equally candid and reproached the erudite author with inability to reduce his material to order His volumes indeed remain the standard work on the subject. But they have acted as an awful warning and kept would-be successors off the ground of Franco-Scottish relationships When his son, Roland Francisque-Michel, published an analogous study of the relations between France and Portugal, he took the paternal work as a model In Roland's characterisation of the family turn of mind, father and son unwittingly stand condemned He says that he, like his father before him, has sought facts rather than ideas 'Que lui importait que ces faits eussent une valeur morale, une importance, pourvu qu'ils fussent curieux et rares? Ma race n'est point éprise de généralisations, le génie de l'abstraction n'est pas le sien.' *Les Ecossais en France* is a mine of facts, but the clue to their significance is missing

Disappointed with the reception accorded to the book, Michel was inclined to explain away its comparative failure by the fact of its being written in French, though published in England. He therefore chose English as the proper medium for his other large work on a Scottish subject—the *Critical Inquiry into the Scottish Language* (1882). This is an attempt to show French influence on Scottish civilisation by a study of the French words in the Scottish vernacular, and ends by proving a good deal more than the words—or the facts—warrant. The epithet 'Critical' which designates the 'Inquiry' in the title is sadly belied on almost every page. As a philological inquiry it is quite uncritical and largely valueless. But it was the fruit of many years' work, many visits to Scotland and much consultation of Scottish friends.

These Scottish friends were numerous. Some he had met during his first mission. Others were later acquaintances. Edinburgh in 1837 counted among her worthies many enthusiasts for the past. Her libraries, her Register House were living centres of interest. Her 'Historical Clubs' displayed an activity unrivalled since. Members of such circles could not but welcome a young French scholar. Most of them belonged to an older generation. The Register House was in charge of a friend and contemporary of Scott's, Thomas Thomson He now presided over the Bannatyne Club in the room of Sir Walter, its first President. He had published many documents for the Club and some of them were French. The Keeper of the Advocates' Library was old David Irving, and at the

Signet Library was another David, the celebrated David Laing. Robert Pitcairn and James Maidment, both active members of the Bannatyne Club, were contemporaries of Laing. With all of these Michel became acquainted.

An Edinburgh scholar nearer to Michel in age was the Secretary to the Abbotsford Club. He was an architect and, having an unusual number of initials, was known to local fame as 'Alphabet' Turnbull. Interested in France, Turnbull had already shown those leanings towards Catholicism which resulted in his reception into the Church of Rome in 1843. As Secretary of the Abbotsford Club he corresponded with Michel, after the latter's return to France, about the edition of the Old French *Fergus*, which Michel was preparing for the Club. The correspondence sometimes verged on the acrimonious. Michel complained to Laing that Turnbull was multiplying the difficulties, 'les obstacles qui gênent la marche d'une publication faite en Ecosse par un habitant de Bordeaux.' But friendly relations continued. After Turnbull removed to London, about 1853, Michel was a welcome and frequent guest at the chambers in Lincoln's Inn where the quondam architect was now a barrister. Versatile himself, Turnbull contemplated his friend's multifarious activities with humorous dismay: 'What with his *Scots in France* and other works, his hands are full of what would sufficiently occupy half-a-dozen brains.' He questioned the wisdom of a venture into Scottish fields. 'Omnia tentat,' he wrote to Laing. 'Besides his own country's lore, he is going to tend our sheep.' The misgivings with which Turnbull watched the progress of *Les Ecossais en France* were founded on no mean acquaintance with the topic. He had himself collected a considerable amount of material on the Scottish Archer Guard in France, and in 1855 had thoughts of taking over the task himself and writing a book on the subject from his own and Michel's notes, if the 'little fellow' would hand them over. After some years in London, he became an assistant under the Record Commission and was thus favourably placed for helping his friends to obtain access to unpublished material. From Michel's London visits Turnbull appears to have derived no small entertainment. In one of his letters to Laing he hints at remarkable prowess in the consumption of two oddly-assorted substances, beer and marmalade, on the part of 'our Gallican.' On another occasion when 'our friend Michel' had arrived, accompanied by Madame, 'a very agreeable woman, *vid no Inghse*,' he reports that 'the *Chevalier* is in great force.' Yet, though amused, Turnbull was a good friend and was a very present help in the trouble of 1856 when Michel stood his trial at the Old Bailey. Michel returned the compliment by enlisting the good

offices of Prosper Mérimée on Turnbull's behalf with the Minister of Public Instruction<sup>1</sup>.

The cheerful Turnbull's career ended in disaster. In 1861 Michel learnt with distress that Turnbull had been penalised for his religious convictions. The prejudice and suspicion attached to Catholicism had forced him to resign his post under the Record Commission. It was indeed, as Michel termed it to Laing, 'a sad business,' and Turnbull's friends could only grieve for him. Two years later Turnbull was dead.

David Laing's kindly help and interest were invaluable to the young French visitor. Besides being the Librarian of the Writers to the Signet, Laing had been the Secretary of the Bannatyne Club since its foundation in 1822 by Scott and his friends. Having, as the son of a bookseller, a hereditary *flair* for such things, and living in the heroic age of book-collecting, Laing had acquired many rare books and curious MSS. His collection of printed books alone fetched at his death nearly £17,000. These treasures he displayed to Michel on his first visit, notably a MS. containing hymns inspired by St Thomas of Canterbury, and both as a collector and as a host won Michel's warm gratitude.

A year later, with much correspondence in the interval, they met again in Paris, when Laing was touring the Continent with some Scottish friends<sup>2</sup>. The long correspondence that followed formed Michel's chief link with Scotland till he returned many years later. Their personal contact was resumed and renewed on almost annual visits till Laing's death in 1878. There is a pause in their correspondence between 1843 and 1845, and again for the years 1849-52 there are no letters extant, but with these exceptions, the exchange was regular. Laing's side of the correspondence was perhaps the less active. At least Michel occasionally reproaches him with silence and with the character 'peu communicatif' of his letters.

The letters to Laing have a distinctly intimate and personal tone, though the chief topic is, as ever, the progress of Michel's own researches and publications. The 'Mon cher Monsieur David,' with which the very first begins, or even the 'Mon cher David,' proves little. To Michel, Sir Frederic Madden, with whom he was not really intimate, was frequently 'Mon cher Frederic.' But there are other evidences of closer acquaintance. Michel stayed many a time in Laing's hospitable home, where kindly maiden

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres à Francisque Michel* (1848-70), Paris, 1930, p. 42. (*Œuvres complètes de Prosper Mérimée*. Edition Trahard.)

<sup>2</sup> Gilbert Goudie, *David Laing, LL.D. A Memoir of his Life and literary work*, Edinburgh, 1913, p. 70.

sisters did the honours in homely Scottish fashion. Between them and Madame Michel little presents were exchanged. The prestige of Scottish housewifery was maintained at Bordeaux by samples of Miss Laing's home-made marmalade. French taste and artistic skill were represented at Portobello by Madame Michel's hand-painted screens. Whatever might be the disadvantages of 'exile' in Bordeaux, there was at least the advantage of proximity to famous vineyards and Laing, like others of Michel's friends, procured claret direct from the best sources of supply.

Michel's friends profited by his friendship with one of Edinburgh's most prominent literary men, 'the patriarch of Scottish literature,' as Michel calls him in a letter of 1862. Many a French visitor to Scotland arrived with an introduction from Michel to Laing and was hospitably received. In 1852 came no less a personage than Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, whose influence was more than once exerted upon Michel's administrative superiors, to prolong beyond the statutory vacation period the professor's absence from Bordeaux. Sometimes the visitors belonged to the bookselling and publishing world. the young son of Maulde the printer<sup>1</sup>, who was finishing his education in Great Britain, the successor of old Silvestre, the bookseller, M. Jannet, who hoped to make some business connexions in Scotland, through Laing's 'légitime et puissante influence sur les bibliophiles d'Edinburgh.'

Two years after Michel's first mission to Scotland, another young French scholar arrived in Edinburgh on a similar errand, inspired, no doubt, by favourable accounts received from his predecessor. This was M. Teulet, a friend of Michel's and, later, a relative by marriage. He brought with him an introduction from Michel to David Laing and no doubt to other Edinburgh acquaintances. Teulet followed closely in his predecessor's footsteps, entering into friendly relations with Laing, corresponding with him after his return to France<sup>2</sup>, undertaking a publication for the Bannatyne Club<sup>3</sup>, and becoming a member of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. When the Misses Laing visited Paris in the summer of 1841, M. Teulet showed them some polite attention. But his relations with Scotland were less close than Michel's. His knowledge of English, even after two visits to the country, was defective. He found the letters of his English friends difficult to decipher, especially Laing's, written in a

<sup>1</sup> Maulde père also visited Edinburgh. There are some friendly letters from him among Laing's papers.

<sup>2</sup> Fifty-eight letters from Teulet are preserved among Laing's papers. Their tone is rather more formal than Michel's.

<sup>3</sup> *Papiers d'Etat relatifs à l'Histoire d'Ecosse au 16<sup>e</sup> siècle tirés des Bibliothèques et des Archives de France et publiés pour le Bannatyne Club d'Edimbourg*, Paris [1851-60], 3 vols., 4to.

dasling hand, which gave trouble even to his compatriots. His health, moreover, was poor, and it was not improved by a wound which he received in the street fighting in June 1848. For all these reasons he did not dispute a monopoly of the English and Scottish friends whom Michel, especially after a coolness had arisen between them, was little inclined to share with him.

Laing and Michel had of course much in common. Between the two book-lovers there were traffickings in books. Michel was in touch with the chief antiquarian booksellers in Paris and eager to serve as their intermediary in Edinburgh. On his return to Paris in 1838 he had taken with him a consignment of books from Laing, which Téchener sold immediately. The successful disposal of the first lot encouraged him to ask Laing for a further despatch. He also sent books to Scotland—at least once, in 1840, direct by a ship sailing from Bordeaux to Glasgow. It would be interesting to know more of the detail of these transactions, and indeed of that of Anglo-French interchange of books generally. There can be no doubt that the exports and imports of French and English booksellers, their business and often friendly relations with their foreign confrères, form, or did form in the pre-broadcasting age, one of the most important sources of intra-national influence.

Laing's father, the bookseller, had often gone to the Continent on business, and he himself occasionally travelled abroad, for business or pleasure. On one of these journeys—to Italy in 1840—he was indebted to Michel for an introduction to Costanzo Gazzero, Librarian of the University and Secretary of the Academy of Turin, and, through Gazzero, to other scholars in Naples, Rome and Florence. Michel on that occasion also offered to enlist in the same cause the services of his friend the 'bibliophile Jacob.'

Michel was very anxious that Laing should accompany him on a visit to Spain, in his letters of 1845, 1846 and 1847, he is always trying to whet Laing's appetite by accounts of his own experiences, his knowledge of the language and the country. But the project, though favourably entertained by Laing, did not materialise.

Michel's friendships were not always disinterested. Laing obtained his election to the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, and was promptly requested to do the same service for La Renaudière, Monmerqué and Wolf of Vienna. His help was also expected in the matter of English and Scots slang and French MSS. in Scotland, and in bringing influence to bear on learned clubs to publish Michel's editions of various early texts. *Fergus* had appeared at the expense of the Abbotsford Club, *La Manekine*



and *Horn et Rimnhild* at the expense of the Bannatyne. Their successors, in preparation from 1843 onwards, would, Michel hoped, be similarly subsidised. But his repeated appeals to Laing remained unsuccessful. His *Ecossois en France*, of which he says 'Mon sujet est tellement écossois qu'il me serait difficile, je pense, de trouver un éditeur français,' and which he had hoped Laing might arrange to have published in Scotland, was eventually published in London.

With the other scholars whom Michel had met on his first visit to Edinburgh his relations continued for some years afterwards on account of his publications for Edinburgh Societies, but seem in time to have lapsed. He still, in his letters to Laing, sends his remembrances to them by name, but by 1848 he doubts whether anyone in Edinburgh remembers him. When he revisited Scotland seven years later, most of his original acquaintances were still alive, but he seems to have been more successful in making new friends than in resuming relations with old. These, he complains to Laing in December 1857, displayed a certain coolness and had not even answered his letters, 'au risque de faire douter de la politesse écossoise.' Reasons are not far to seek. Michel was for the time being under a cloud. Immediately after the Archaeological Congress in Edinburgh he had appeared in London before a criminal court. He had been acquitted, but, as so often happens, acquittal had not at once fully rehabilitated him in public esteem. Moreover, too assiduous cultivation of Secretaries and members of Clubs publishing early texts made his motives appear interested and displeasing.

His new acquaintances included both scholars and men of means who could introduce him to Scottish social life. The former are represented by J. T. Gibson-Craig, Cosmo Innes, Joseph Robertson, and the Aberdonian Alexander Dyce, a friend of Laing and Turnbull, whom he used to meet in London; the latter by Mr William Burns of Glasgow who made him welcome on more than one visit to his hospitable home at Dowanhill, by Provost Murrie of Stirling, where the life of a small Scottish town could be sampled, and Mr Gray, banker at Golspie, to which remote northern town Michel undertook in 1864 the then formidable journey. The scholarship that may ripen within 'the quiet bounds of a Scottish manse' he learnt to appreciate in the person of the Rev. Walter Gregor, minister of Pitsligo (Aberdeenshire), who gave him valuable assistance, duly acknowledged in the preface, with his *Inquiry into the Scottish Language*. Of the Scottish nobility he was enabled to form a personal opinion. 'I entertain high [*sic*] opinion of your Scottish peers,' he writes to Laing. How many specimens

he had examined at close quarters is not clear, but one he certainly did know—Lord Lindsay, afterwards Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, and head of a family uniting in itself the traditions of both France and Scotland. Lord Lindsay had, in the course of his own researches, become aware of Michel's genealogical lore and corresponded with him from 1858. He apparently showed him considerable kindness, helping to make *Les Ecosais en France* better known and in 1864 entertaining Michel, Mme Michel and Roland, on their way to Golspie, at his Aberdeenshire seat, Dunecht. To this noble and learned patron Michel subsequently dedicated his *Inquiry into the Scottish Language*.

This account of Michel's relations with Scotland shows that his claim to hold a special position as an intermediary between France and Scotland and an authority on all things Scottish was founded on fact. In cultivating this Scottish connexion his motives were no doubt mixed. love of learning, vanity, ambition. Yet his vast store of dry-as-dust information about Scotland's past and his personal acquaintance with the country and its people did give him a privileged position. He had an unrivalled opportunity of interpreting Scotland to herself and to her neighbours. By his failure to present his material in readable form an opportunity was lost which is unlikely to occur again. Yet all was not wasted. His life and work did something to keep the tradition of the 'Auld Alliance' alive throughout the nineteenth century. The scholars, both the Scots and the French, are ironical at his expense. Yet to this day among the educated Scottish public his name is still remembered and the unwary have been known to confuse Michelet with 'the great French scholar Francisque-Michel.'

CLAUDINE I. WILSON.

LONDON.

<sup>2</sup> Author of *De l'Influence attribuée aux Philosophes, Franc-Maçons et Illuminés sur la Révolution de France*, Tübingen, 1801, the first book to be reviewed by the *Edinburgh*. It was translated into English in 1801 by J. Walker, M A, of St John's College, Cambridge (later Bishop of Edinburgh), the English chaplain at Belvedere. Cf. also F. Baldensperger, *Le mouvement des idées dans l'émigration française* (1789-1815), II, Paris, 1924, pp. 26 f. and 282-91. Macdonald did much to advertise Mounier's academy in Scotland, translating and circulating the prospectus which had appeared in the *Neuer Teutscher Merkur* (I, 1799, p. 96 f.) (letter 58). It is possible that Mounier's book was partly due to a suggestion of his. He was interested in the controversy, which then raged so bitterly, regarding the alleged political activity of the Freemasons and Illuminati: he apparently did his best (letter 12) to clear German Freemasonry from the charges brought against it by his countrymen, and in 1798 suggested to Bottiger that a reply should be written to Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy against all the Religions and Governments of Europe, carried on in the secret meetings of Freemasons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*, Edinburgh, 1797 (4th ed. 1798), which supported the assertions of Barruel's *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du jacobinisme* (1797-9). Robison's book, he wrote, 'has raised violent prejudices here and if unanswered will make the German name hateful in Scotland for a few years at least' (41). He offered to translate a reply to it. A letter in the *Merkur* (II, 1800, pp. 249-54), 'aus dem Briefe eines Engländers' (perhaps Macdonald), vindicated Robison's sincerity from personal acquaintance.

house he dined, Macdonald received introductions to all the Weimar celebrities. He seems to have been well received everywhere. His circle of friends widened considerably during his residence in Leipzig, where his protégé studied from the spring of 1797 to the spring of 1798. In the summer of 1797 he made a journey to Dresden and Berlin; he has left a manuscript account of his impressions. The two Macdonalds returned to England, *via* Hamburg, early in 1798.

Of Macdonald's many acquaintances the Duke Karl August, Goethe, Schiller, Wieland, Herder, Klopstock, Jean Paul, Weiße, Nicolai, Adelung and Emilie von Berlepsch are the most prominent. In Weimar he taught English to Amalie Ludacus, who later achieved some fame as a translator. His advice on matters relating to England was freely sought and readily given. Not only was he consulted on more general points in connexion with articles on England in the *Neuer Teutscher Merkur*, which Bottiger edited, and the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, but, in particular, as a Hebridean and a Gaelic-speaker, he was keenly questioned from all sides on the authenticity of the Ossianic poems. His testimony, based on personal recollections, is of some interest in relation to the problem as a whole. It was certainly of supreme importance in encouraging Herder, in his last years, to resume his studies of Ossian with renewed hope and to prepare himself for the task of making a translation from the original Gaelic, as soon as this should appear.

After his return to Scotland in 1798, Macdonald was ordained, and appointed Minister of Anstruther Wester in 1799. He seems to have played a conspicuous part as an apostle of German culture. He was in close contact with interested University circles in Edinburgh, which perhaps still remembered MacKenzie's famous lecture. Hugh Blair, Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, and Sir John Sinclair were among his friends, and James Playfair, Principal of the United College, St Andrews, was his father-in-law. In 1799 he received an embarrassing visit from Emilie von Berlepsch, and accompanied her on a part of her journey through Scotland, which she was to describe in her *Caledonia* (Hamburg, 1802-3). In 1804 Macdonald resigned office and again travelled in Germany, finally spending well over a year in Austria. He was in England again in 1807, but his last years are wrapped in obscurity. His adventurous life came to a close in 1810 in Edinburgh, where he died from injuries received in a shipwreck off the Jutland coast in November, 1808.

Macdonald's published works are: *Travels through Denmark and Parts of Sweden* (London, 1809), *General View of the Agriculture of the Hebrides*

(Edinburgh, 1811), a translation of part of Bishop Carswell's Gaelic Prayer Book of 1567 (in Leyden's *Scottish Descriptive Poems*, Edinburgh, 1803), articles on Augsburg and Austria in Sir David Brewster's *Edinburgh Encyclopædia* (1830), the important article on Lichtenberg's *Vermischte Schriften* in the *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1804<sup>1</sup>, and the preface and notes to the German translation of Faujas de St Fond's *Voyage en Angleterre, en Écosse et aux îles Hébrides*<sup>2</sup>. In addition, he was the author of the manuscript of which Dietrich Wilhelm Soltau, the translator of *Don Quixote*, published a condensed German version<sup>3</sup>, *Reise durch Schottland, seine Inseln, Danemark und einen Theil von Deutschland* (Leipzig, 1808), and of several contributions to the *Neuer Teutscher Merkur* on the Ossianic question. His copious correspondence with Bottiger is still preserved in Dresden<sup>4</sup>. While containing much that is of minor importance, it is valuable for the variety of information it yields on Anglo-German literary relations at the end of the eighteenth century, in which Macdonald played a twofold part, as adviser on English literature in Germany and on German literature in England—the more important as he was one of the earliest of the stream of English visitors to Weimar. His relationship with his Weimar acquaintances and his efforts to introduce their works into Scotland form the most interesting section of his remarks. Of these efforts Macdonald was, not unpardonably, proud.

Macdonald made an extremely good impression on all his German friends. Everyone seems to have been delighted with his personality and impressed by his culture and ability. Wieland's admiration was undisguisedly enthusiastic<sup>5</sup>: 'er liebt Sie [wrote Bottiger]—es sind seine eignen Worte—wie seinen jüngern Bruder, und nie komme ich zu ihm, ohne gefragt zu werden, was ich von Ihnen wisse' (XV). Herder was no less entranced. Karl August was sufficiently satisfied with his capacity to offer him the headship of the Belvedere Academy, when it fell vacant in 1802. Macdonald's manifest sympathy for all that was best in German culture won him universal respect and his hope that Weimar classicism

<sup>1</sup> On this article see F. W. Stokoe (who, however, imagines it to have been written by Jeffrey), *German Influence in the English Romantic Period, 1788-1818*, Cambridge, 1926, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> *Reise durch Schottland und die Hebriden aus dem Französischen übersetzt mit theils eignen, theils ungedruckten Anmerkungen des Herrn James Macdonald vermehrt*, von C. R. W. Wiedemann, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1799.

<sup>3</sup> It was censored by Goschen because of its political outspokenness (L. Gerhardt, *Schriftsteller und Buchhändler vor hundert Jahren K. A. Bottiger und G. J. Göschen im Briefwechsel*, Leipzig, 1911, pp. 195-8).

<sup>4</sup> Mscr. Dresd. h. 37.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. especially K. W. Bottiger, *Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen*, II, Leipzig, 1838, p. 173 f. According to Bottiger (I, p. 6), William Macdonald was James' nephew.

would ultimately direct the taste, not of Germany alone, but of Europe, secured him ready co-operation. Himself intensely patriotic, even chauvinistic, he was repelled by the 'Gallicomanie' and the 'cursed affectation of speaking foreign tongues' (8) which he encountered, especially in Leipzig, and couched his condemnation in the most vigorous language. Wieland seems to have been in complete agreement with him on this point (IX). Macdonald was indefatigable, moreover, in his efforts to ensure that the consequent one-sided view of English policy might be corrected, and repeatedly urged Bottiger to do his best through the *Merkur*. He found a most capable ally and fellow-propagandist in Herbert Marsh, later Bishop of Peterborough, who was at that time studying at Leipzig and who had acquired an unrivalled command of the German language. Marsh's campaign culminated in his famous *Historische Übersicht der Politik Englands und Frankreichs von der Zeit der Conferenz zu Pillnitz bis zur Kriegserklärung gegen England* (Leipzig, 1799), which secured its author the favour of Pitt<sup>1</sup>. Letters from Marsh also appeared in the *Merkur*<sup>2</sup>. It was Marsh, further, who at Bottiger's request looked through the proofs of the surveys of the newest English books that appeared from time to time in the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*.

If Macdonald's judgments are not everywhere in advance of those of contemporary English criticism, at least they rest on a wide and varied acquaintance with German literature. He was a sound scholar and the friendship of Blair is an indication of the esteem in which he was held<sup>3</sup>. Of his ability and intelligence in literary matters his work on the Ossianic question is sufficient evidence. He seems to have had always before him Herder's critical ideal: 'the more I see,' he wrote in November, 1797, 'the more I learn the propriety and sound sense of a remark once made by Herder to a petulant observation of Mrs Kalbe<sup>4</sup> "that a writer who does not see *every side* of the object he writes upon, and their relative situation both with respect to the object and what surrounds it, should have the modesty to hold his tongue"' (11). He was a sincere and en-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. D.N.B. and Sir L. Stephen, 'The Importation of German' in *Studies of a Biographer*, II, London, 1898, p. 43. Marsh's book appeared in an English translation in two volumes, London, 1800.

<sup>2</sup> One is entitled 'Wer ist Fox, der Staatsmann?' (II, 1798, pp. 271-85). Two further letters which were published in 1798 (I, pp. 323-38 and II, p. 197) are certainly from Marsh's pen; the former is referred to by Marsh in his preface to the English translation of his book and also in the letter on Fox: it is a defence of English policy, the second deals with the freedom of the press in England.

<sup>3</sup> Bottiger sought his advice, on Wieland's behalf, regarding an English translation of Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, which Wieland was preparing to translate (XV).

<sup>4</sup> Charlotte von Kalb.

thusiastic worker on behalf of German literature when interest in this country was rapidly growing but discriminating criticism rare. If we are to believe his own statements, and there is no reason to suspect him of misrepresenting the facts, he must have been accounted an authority in Scottish circles.

Goethe's distinction he accepted as a matter of course, if with a little indifference he seems, however, to have been free from some of the prejudices of his contemporaries. Schiller, on the other hand, although 'unquestionably a man of uncommon genius,' as Macdonald observed in the *Edinburgh Review*<sup>1</sup>, was ranked with Iffland and Kotzebue. But then Schiller, in his *Wallenstein*, had been guilty of an unforgivable offence, which Macdonald had some difficulty in explaining away, as he hastened to point out in a letter to Böttiger. 'Some Scotchmen,' he protested, 'have been mortally offended at his changing the original name which he had in his manuscript into that of Macdonald, and could not conceive any reason for it, but some disgust and dislike that William and I (the only Macdonalds he ever saw) had occasioned to him or to his friends at Weimar. Among others, Lord Macdonald mentioned this to me, swearing at the same time that Schiller should not pass unpunished for such insolence. I assured him calmly that I was conscious of no offence or disgust I had given to any man at Weimar, that I had only seen Schiller once, that I could not believe that he meant any insult to me or William or Scotland or the name of Macdonald, that I felt no anger at him for it, that he was entitled to put into his tragedy any name he pleased without being responsible to any Briton for his choice, that probably as Macdonald is a very numerous and warlike clan, there may have been in the Austrian army some person of the name, so that out of 40 or 50,000 of which our Clan consists some one murderer or assassin may easily be found etc etc. all this served no purpose but to irritate his Lordship the more. . . It is well therefore if you *delicately* hint to your friends Goethe and Schiller the offence that this has given in Scotland, and this is the more proper as Mr Macdonald of Glengary, Coll. of a Regiment of Fencibles and a hot, proud young man, is now on his travels in Germany, and may probably visit Weimar on his route; therefore I wish very much that Schiller and he may not interfere, for mischief and perhaps blood must be the consequence. . . I fear it will cost Scotland and Germany some of their citizens if any unlucky collisions take place' (46). In face of his Lordship's indignation Böttiger was only able to make the prosaic reply that Schiller had intended to

<sup>1</sup> Vol III, p. 345.

indicate that the name was historical (XXI)<sup>1</sup>. Schiller's contributions to the 'Sturm und Drang' drama did nothing to increase his prestige in the eyes of the Presbyterian minister, who resented their violence and outspokenness. Macdonald gladly preferred Iffland, for 'drawing his countrymen from the silly taste for pieces of chivalry and gigantic nonsense that were since a few years ago so eagerly sought after by the public,' meaning *Gotz* and *Die Rauber*<sup>2</sup>. Yet this seems to have been Iffland's only merit, for 'excepting a few pieces of Lessing and Goethe, and a very few of Mr Schiller, the German language cannot boast of any good dramatical piece<sup>3</sup>'. Macdonald's taste was all for the French classical drama. When he wrote to Bottiger that Goethe's connexion with Schiller was not well known in Scotland, he added the annihilating observation, 'it is as well' (46). It was obviously no easy matter for Schiller to live down such a reputation, and his *Maria Stuart* seems to have done nothing to help him. 'Your Schiller [remarked Macdonald on 1 January, 1803] has not increased his popularity here by his *Queen Mary* nor indeed by anything he has written since his *Rauber* and his *30 Years' War*<sup>4</sup>' (58). A further letter is more explicit: 'A man capable of putting such speeches into the mouths of Queens, as he does [into those] of Queen Mary and Elizabeth, proves himself too much a stranger to the decencies of social life to be able to delineate the shades of character so as to produce a good drama ...' This is 'the opinion of every good man of candour with whom I have conversed on the subject' (56).

If Macdonald was severe on Schiller, he was infuriated by the mere name of Kant and even Wieland's displeasure<sup>5</sup> could not alter his uncompromising attitude. His letters seethe with condemnation: the one which Bottiger reproduced, in a diplomatically expurgated form, in the *Merkur*<sup>6</sup>, as illustrative of the British attitude towards the critical philo-

<sup>1</sup> Schiller found the name in Murr (Cf. *Wallensteins Tod*, ed. K. Breul, Cambridge, 1913, p. 266.)

<sup>2</sup> Reisejournal durch Deutschland über Sachsen bis Berlin, 1797 (Mscr. Dresd. h. 37.)

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps the fault was not solely Macdonald's. Bottiger was not a very discerning informant, he thought *Maria Stuart* 'am Ende ein sehr trostloses Stück, nicht, wie die Tragödie der Alten, durch Furcht und Mitleid die Seelen der Zuschauer reinigend'. 'An der Elisabeth,' he continued, '(alle funfzehn Engländer in Belvedere und wer sonst hier von den brittischen Inseln wohnt, waren emport über die Herabwürdigung der Elisabeth, wie es Schiller angestellt hat) kann auch niemand Theil nehmen ... Kurz, das verwundete Herz des Zuschauers findet nirgends einen lindernden Balsam ... Ich habe in ein englisches Journal eine Skizze des Stücks geschickt. Da werden Sie vielleicht, wenn der Monthly Magazine zu Ihnen kommt, etwas mehr davon lesen' (XXI). However, Bottiger's review appeared, not in the *Monthly Magazine*, but in the *Monthly Review* (x, 1800, pp. 170-2), doubtless through Huttner's (*v. infra*) agency.

<sup>5</sup> Goethes *Uebersprache* Gesamtausgabe, neu hg. von F. v. Biedermann, I, Leipzig, 1909, p. 273, and K. W. Bottiger, *op. cit.*, I, p. 239.

<sup>6</sup> II. 1798, p. 393 f. The original is letter 40. On the whole question of the English attitude to Kant see R. Wellek, *Immanuel Kant in England*, Princeton, 1931.



sophy, is extremely mild by comparison with similar ones which he did not choose to publish. The following is a fair sample of Macdonald's view: 'I once thought that no fanaticism was intolerable except the religious species, but alas! the philosophical-metaphysical is ten times more teasing. The former indeed burnt people alive, but the latter, after fretting them by long tedious draughts of nonsense, roasts away their juices of humanity or rather steals them out dropwise, without knowing whither they go' (31). His antipathy not only accounted for much of his interest in Herder's later works but went so far as to lead him to study with 'uncommon amusement' Nicolai's satirical novel *Sempronius Gundiibert*, which Wieland, doubtless with a sly chuckle, asked Bottiger to send him in September, 1798, and to repeat with as much fervour as its author Nicolai's prayer: 'Statt verschobener Philosophie möge in der deutschen Litteratur gesunde Vernunft regieren, Amen!' (43).

It is a welcome change from such austerities to turn to Macdonald's opinion of Klopstock, whom he met on the way back to England early in 1798. Through Bottiger, the poet had applied for and received information emphasising the essentially lyrical character of Ossianic poetry (21). Macdonald's account of the interview is an interesting pendant to the more famous and penetrating one of Coleridge<sup>1</sup>. 'He possesses in an eminent degree [he observed] that ease of manner, that condescending familiarity with ordinary topics of conversation and the plainest mode of supporting them, for which I found the literati of your country so much superior to those of my own. Klopstock, like Herder and Wieland, is able to delight by his conversation the philosopher as well as the enthusiastic poet, the nobleman or the peasant, and to the sprightliness of a fine woman adds the charming simplicity of a child. He would not speak of his own works any further than to prove that his avoiding it was modesty and not affectation. His declamation of his own odes (for he favoured me by reading two of them) is remarkably impressive, and shews how much he feels what his pen transmits to posterity. The manner in which he spoke of Herder and Wieland also delighted me. Wieland's works will always be more read than Klopstock's and of course one would think that Klopstock would be jealous and at least observe silence when his rival is praised. Quite the contrary.—He did not hesitate to place his rivals in the first rank of European writers. He agreed also with my opinion of Herder's *Terpsichore* and *Ideen*, as well as my favourite essay of Herder upon "Language." He asked me some questions about Ossian and a specimen of his poetry. I repeated some lines,

<sup>1</sup> *Biogr. Literaria*, ed. by J. Shawcross, II, Oxford, 1907, pp. 169-79.

but had not time to give him any in writing. He will probably have recourse to Herder. I shall send him some from Edinburgh when I shall be at leisure' (39).

For his heroes, Wieland and Herder, Macdonald was full of enthusiasm. His admiration was genuinely reciprocated. To Wieland, 'whom no one can see for an hour without loving him' (25), he was attracted from the first<sup>1</sup>. He was drawn to Herder because of his Ossianic interests and hostility to Kant, and, like many of his contemporaries<sup>2</sup>, revered him as the 'German Plato' (20). After his return to Scotland Macdonald remained in close touch with his two friends and corresponded with them<sup>3</sup>, though Bottiger generally acted as their agent. It was Bottiger who kept Macdonald posted with literary and political news and well supplied with the latest books and periodicals. He regularly sent him the newest works of Goethe and Schiller and of Wieland and Herder, as well as the *Merkur*, the *Litteratur-Zeitung* and his own *London und Paris*<sup>4</sup>.

Bottiger's assiduity was not in vain, for Macdonald was a tireless propagandist for Germany among his friends in Edinburgh, where some considerable interest had existed since Henry MacKenzie's lecture on the German drama in 1788. Yet if, as he remarks (41), Wolfing's *Briefe eines reisenden Franzosen über Deutschland* (Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1796) were really accepted as an authority on Germany, Macdonald's efforts were perhaps very necessary<sup>5</sup>. But on vital points he gives us frequently

<sup>1</sup> Wieland presented him with the MS. of the third of the *Gespräche unter vier Augen* (XIV).

<sup>2</sup> E.g., Fr. v. Matthiesson (*Schriften*, III, Zurich, 1825, p. 288). see also Wm. Taylor, *Historic Survey*, III, p. 40 ('the Plato of the Christian world').

<sup>3</sup> His letters to Herder are printed in *Herder und Ossian*, App. A letter from Herder to Macdonald (dated 26 May, 1799) is given in K. W. Bottiger, *op. cit.*, II, p. 193 f.

<sup>4</sup> On the purpose of this Bottiger wrote (XV) '... Sie werden finden, daß ich nur durch so vergoldete Pillen meine Landsleute von der Gallcomame befreien und auf die unülbaren Vorzüge Britanniens aufmerksam machen konnte. Sie werden bald finden, daß unser Pariser Correspondent nichts weniger als ein blinder Bewunderer der großen Nation ist, daß aber unser braver Huttner (denn diesen werden Sie ja wohl ohne mein Zuthun erkennen—er will aber ganz unbekannt bleiben) den Engländern volle Gerechtigkeit widerfahren läßt. Die Caricaturen thun dann auch das übrige. Die Medien wirkt schon und das Journal wird sehr stark gelesen.' Marsh and Macdonald had evidently phleged Bottiger very hard. On Huttner see below.

<sup>5</sup> It is interesting to compare Niebuhr's remarks on the state of German studies in Edinburgh in 1799. 'An keinem Orte in England,' he reported in a letter of Feb. 11, 1799, 'ist die Aufmerksamkeit auf deutsche Litteratur so groß wie hier, und die Zahl derer, die Deutsch genug wissen, um etwas zu lesen und Bücher in unsrer Sprache anzuschaffen, ist nicht unbeträchtlich, aber sie kennen nur solche Bücher, als ihnen ein Ungefähr zur Kunde bringt. Kants Name ist hier schon bekannt, dies haben verschiedene Deutsche, die mit ungleicher Geschicklichkeit das Apostelamt übernommen haben, bewirkt. Seine Werke sind in den Händen verschiedener Gelehrten dieser Stadt. Aber die Verstellungen von seiner Philosophie sind curios verworren.' 'Schiller [of the *Sturm und Drang* period of course] ist der bewundertste deutsche Dichter,' he added in the same month (*Lebensnachrichten über B. G. Niebuhr*, I, Hamburg, 1838, pp. 222 and 225.) Dugald Stewart was notoriously ill-acquainted with the work of the German philosophers.

only tantalising scraps of information the meagreness of precise detail regarding his own activity is often most disappointing and baffling. The important article on Lichtenberg in the *Edinburgh Review* of January, 1804, has already been noted. Macdonald states at the same time (letter 62) that he contributed articles to the previous number. It is unfortunate that these cannot be identified with any certainty, for the 'proud, insular tinge' (61), which he rightly declared to be peculiar to his style, is not at all foreign to that of other reviewers<sup>1</sup>. Further, he told Bottiger in 1798 that he knew of two (hitherto unknown) translations of Wieland's *Oberon* (existing probably only in manuscript) one by 'Mr Scott in Scotland,' the other by a certain 'S N' (21)<sup>2</sup>. In January, 1799, he proudly wrote 'In Scotland the German language and writers are infinitely better known and more esteemed than in any part of England or Europe, London and Petersburg excepted Dr Baird<sup>3</sup>, Professor Finlayson<sup>4</sup>, Christison of the High School<sup>5</sup>, Lords Glenlee<sup>6</sup>, Monboddo<sup>7</sup>, David Hume, nephew of the historian<sup>8</sup> have good German libraries and understand the language very well' (43). 'Goethe and Schiller are the Scotch favourites, as Kotzebue is the English. Iffland's plays are almost unknown,' he noted in the same year (45). In June, 1798, he had reported a proposal to found a German society 'for learning and practising' the language, behind which was no less a person than Baird himself (40): 'Wieland,' he had added, 'is well known, Klopstock

<sup>1</sup> However, of the articles in No. 5 which Copinger (*On the Authorship of the first hundred Numbers of the Edinburgh Review*, Manchester, 1895) does not account for, none is concerned with German literature.

<sup>2</sup> One would like, of course, to think of Sir Walter in this connexion, and perhaps not entirely without reason. We know he possessed Wieland's works (1794-1801) (Stokoe, *German Influence*, etc., p. 175), though it is not stated when he acquired them. He further translated a good deal from German (Lockhart, I, 1837, p. 247), though it is true that he specifically mentions the ballad and drama as his chief interests (*Minstrelsy*, IV, 1868, p. 64). Many of his translations remained unpublished (Stokoe, p. 177 f., gives a list of these), some, however, such as his version of *Fresco* (*Letters of Sir Walter Scott, 1787-1807*, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson, London, 1932, p. 57 and note, also F. Even, *The Prestige of Schiller in England*, New York, 1932, p. 51), were lost, and a translation, partial perhaps, of *Oberon*, which Macdonald may have heard of in Edinburgh, could have gone the same way. Scott was supplied with many German classical authors by Skene (*The Skene Papers*, London, 1909, p. 3) and by Mrs Scott of Harden, a relative, and daughter of Count Bruhl of Martinskirchen (Lockhart, I, p. 247). The identity of 'S.N.' is even more mysterious. According to Bottiger (I), Seebach, equerry to the Duke, spread a rumour to the effect that a prize of £2000 had been offered by a group of literary gentlemen in Norwich and Exeter for a verse translation of *Oberon*.<sup>1</sup> Macdonald did not confirm this.

<sup>3</sup> Principal of the University.

<sup>4</sup> James Finlayson (1758-1808), Professor of Logic at Edinburgh.

<sup>5</sup> Alexander Christison (1749-1820), Classical Master at the High School, later (1805) Professor of Humanity in the University (W. Steven, *History of the High School of Edinburgh*, Edinburgh, 1849, App., pp. 96 ff.)

<sup>6</sup> 1755-1846, Scottish judge.

<sup>7</sup> 1714-1799, Scottish judge and man of letters.

<sup>8</sup> 1757-1838, Scottish judge and Professor of Scots Law at Edinburgh. (His lectures were attended by Scott.)

also (but only by name, for nobody reads him) and Herder, whose works I have spread volume by volume among my friends is prodigiously admired for his originality and elevated way of thinking . . . The liveliness of Wieland is much loved.' By 1801 much progress seems to have been made, for Macdonald writes: 'There is such a degree of attention now paid to German literature, that you can hardly believe the extent of it. There are three German teachers at Edinburgh<sup>1</sup> who have more pupils than they can manage, and I can assure you that your books to me have been instrumental in disseminating this German taste. The Countess of Kellie in my neighbourhood here has learnt the German by her own industry and can read Klopstock and Wieland with ease.. I hope to make some of my acquaintance also relish your more difficult works, though I am not to be a disciple or apostle of your metaphysics' (66). Wieland must have been delighted to know that he was the 'particular friend and favourite of the British ladies, who forgive him Amanda's fall<sup>2</sup>, for reasons which they themselves will tell him when he comes to our dear Island' (46) Macdonald was continually asking about Wieland's memoirs and advertising them to his friends: he himself looked forward to the completion of such a work with the greatest eagerness, 'as a compound made up of very rare ingredients, great abilities and an excellent heart whose very faults are a source of interesting pleasure' (25), for he proposed to translate it the moment it appeared

Macdonald was indeed appreciative of Wieland's human and literary qualities, but in the case of Herder there was, in addition, the professional interest. He seems to have taken particular pains to see that his friends and colleagues knew of his works. Two volumes of the *Christliche Schriften* (the fourth and fifth *Sammlungen*), which Bottiger sent in September, 1798, he 'read and re-read, and translated many parts to my friends here, especially to Dr Blair and Dr MacKnight<sup>3</sup> our most celebrated clergymen in this place' (43) and both seem to have been well pleased. They evidently differed appreciably from their colleagues, who held Herder, generally, to be a 'rank socinian' (44). Macdonald hoped that his own translation of the essay *Vom Geist des Christenthums* (in the fourth *Sammlung*) might be published; it was not<sup>4</sup>. Blair at any rate expressed his approval of the work, though he added: 'I fear there are so few who will chuse to understand your German friend aright, that

<sup>1</sup> On the earlier beginnings of German teaching in Edinburgh, and, more especially, the class attended by Scott, see Stokoe, *op cit*, p. 61

<sup>2</sup> *Oberon*, canto vii

<sup>3</sup> James MacKnight, D D (1721-1800), the Biblical scholar.

<sup>4</sup> Macdonald gives the reasons in a letter to Herder (*Herder und Ossian*, p. 184).

his spirit of Christianity will rouse many an evil spirit against him' (66). Except for one point, Macdonald was full of enthusiasm, and that was 'the shortness of his [Herder's] remarks, a very uncommon fault in a theological work' (43)! On Herder's death he made the following observation: 'Herder's death. affected more people in Britain than you would have believed. Though he did not much like our nation, we admired him. Posterity will do him the justice that envy and jealousy denied him in the latter part of his career. I rejoice to learn that we shall soon have a complete edition of his works. Although there is much dross, there is a greater quantity of valuable golden ore' (64).

Macdonald's translations were, however, not confined to the works of Herder. He tells us that he also translated the pamphlet of Gentz, *Seiner königlichen Majestat Friedrich Wilhelm III bei der Thronbesteigung allerunterthanigst überreicht* (Berlin, 1797), which seems to have been much admired (42), and also the important passages from books and periodicals that Böttiger sent him. The least he did was apparently to draw up summaries of the contents of some of them to be circulated among his acquaintances. It is unfortunate that there is no material by which we might judge the quality of his work.

In comparison with Macdonald's Böttiger's letters are disappointing. His endless chatter, which to be sure provided the material for his friend's propaganda, is not remarkable for any particular literary or other discernment, and Macdonald would have done better with a more capable informant. The following specimen is well above the general average. 'Vater Wieland [he wrote on January 1, 1798] war in der verflossenen Woche drei Tage hier. Er grüßt Sie herzlich und bittet dringend, auch ihm bei Ihrer Durchreise<sup>1</sup> mindestens einen Tag zu schenken. Es waren köstliche Stunden, die ich jetzt mit ihm verlebte. Er las bei Herdern die Wolken des Aristophanes vor, die er in drei Wochen ganz vollendet hat<sup>2</sup>. Ein hoher Genuß für uns alle! Es ist mir selbst unbegreiflich, wie er den schwersten aller griechischen Dichter so treu, so genialisch in diesem Alter übersetzen kann. Ich hätte Sie dabey gewünscht, als Wieland bei Göthe mit Herdern frühstückte, und seine Bemerkungen über die Raphaelschen Copieen machte, die Meyer aus Italien mitgebracht hat. Unter andern kam er aufs jüngste Gericht zu reden. Wieland äußerte sein Glaubensbekenntnis wegen eines allgemeinen Erdbrandes durch einen Cometen, den er einmal für gewiß annimmt. "Ich habe oft schon gedacht, setzte er hinzu, daß die dann auf der Erde wohnenden Menschen

<sup>1</sup> Macdonald was in Leipzig.

<sup>2</sup> Wieland's translation appeared in the *Attisches Museum*, II, 1798.

unaussprechliche Angst ausstehen müssen, und wenn ich mich so recht ins Gefühl dieser Geangsteten hineindachte, da bedauerte ichs, daß ich Kinder gezeugt habe, deren späte Urenkel einmal diese Angst treffen soll'' (II). A curious trait in a character of strange contrasts!

The two following letters represent probably all the correspondence that took place between Wieland and Macdonald. They form a delightful illustration of the enthusiasm of the younger man no less than of the undisguised sincerity of Wieland. It is a pity, however, that Macdonald's style was not mellowed by a little of the engaging unaffectedness of his friend's.

*Macdonald to Wieland*<sup>1</sup>.

Edinburgh, May 26/98.

My dear Wieland,

I trust you will receive the copy of *Falconer's Shipwreck*<sup>2</sup> which I have the pleasure of sending you by Mr *Meusel* of Zittau, sometime before the end of this summer, and also not be displeased to learn the welfare of your old acquaintance James Macdonald. Often have I thought of the happy minutes spent at your house of Osmandstadt (*sic*), for I am sorry to say I cannot call them any thing but *minutes*, for fate denied me the hours, days and years which I wished to pass in your neighbourhood.

I never was so fond of Germany, and especially Weimar as I am since I left them. You know, we are unconscious (*sic*) of the best half of any good, until we lose the whole of it.—I cannot say much about myself at present, further than that I am going to Ossian's country soon, in order to visit my father and mother, whence I intend soon to return and settle in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, so that *you*, Herder and Bottiger can pay me a month's visit without any great inconvenience; supposing the French have the good sense to take your good advice and make Bonaparte their King without loss of time. I have the offer of being settled as a clergyman (which order of men is infinitely more respected here than they are in Saxony) and the prospect of soon getting the office of Professor at one of our principal Universities, and that in one of the finest parts of Scotland, bordering on the German ocean, and within three days' easy sail of Hamburg. I might be happy with my father, but I think the former plan the best and intend to follow it. We Scots are not superstitious, and our clergy can be honest men. Ce n'est pas un vilain métier que d'être un ecclésiastique écossais.—Of this country I can say that I find everything better than I expected, and instead of dreading the French we all wish they may have the heart to attack us. They would soon find how much they are mistaken in their ideas of Britain by judging from what is said in the opposition newspapers. I am convinced not *one* of their armée d'Angleterre would return to give the Directory the news of the descent. We have men and resources, courage and *unanimity*, and therefore have nothing to fear. In the literary way we have but little. The army and navy take up our whole attention. When I return from the Hebridean isles you and Bottiger shall have a fuller account of what I can say about this country. The Merkur is well known here, and *your* name is familiar to every ear. I intend to make such parts of your works as have as yet no good translation better known, and also to translate Herder's

<sup>1</sup> Now preserved in the Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv, Weimar.

<sup>2</sup> *The Shipwreck. A Poem in Three Cantos. By a Sailor*, London, 1762, by William Falconer (1732–69). The poem was very successful, the author being freely compared to Homer. It reached a third edition in 1769. It is remarkable for the wealth of nautical technicalities which are introduced, along with the usual copious classical allusions. Austin Dobson ('Falconer's Shipwreck' in *Rosalba's Journal and other Papers*, London, 1915, p. 93) praises it as 'a poem of exceptional originality, vigour and veracity'. See also Johann Friedrich, *William Falconer 'The Shipwreck,' A Poem by a Sailor*, 1762, Vienna and Leipzig, 1901, *Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, xiii.

Ideen if I can command time, in order to shew the proud English that the Germans can think as well as their neighbours Compts. to Mistress Wieland, and all the young people.

Yours always,

JAMES MACDONALD

Wieland to Macdonald<sup>1</sup>.

Oßmanstatt, d 11ten November, 1798

Sie erlauben mir doch, mein liebster Macdonald, Ihnen in der Sprache zu antworten, die mir die gelaufigste, oder vielmehr die einzige ist, in der ich mich mit einiger Bequemlichkeit ausdrücken kann? Haben Sie Dank, Bester, daß Sie sich meines Wunsches, *W Falconers Shipwreck* zu besitzen, so gefällig erinnert haben, aber noch heizlichern Dank für die Freude, die Sie durch das beygelegte freundliche Briefgen in meinem ganzen Hause erregt haben. Ein Brief von unserem Macdonald (denn schon diese wenigen seligen *Stunden*, die auch uns durch Sie zu *Minuten* wurden, haben Sie auf ewig zum *unsigen* gemacht) jubelte von Mund zu Mund, und wir erfreuten uns alle, jedes nach seiner Weise, mit wahrer Theilnehmung, Ihres Wohlbefindens in Ihrem lieben Caledonien, und, mit reinem Dankgefühl, der Liebe, womit Sie Sich unsrer noch erinnern Sie, mein lebenswürdiger, junger Freund haben ein lebendiges Bild von Ihnen in unserm Herzen zurückgelassen, das so unvergänglich ist als unser besseres Selbst, und Erinnerungen, die uns noch offters manchen süßen Augenblick gewahren, und den Schmerz der Trennung und Entbehrung selbst auslöschen, woin wir nur von Zeit zu Zeit Gewißheit erhalten, daß es Ihnen wohl geht

Falconers *Schiffbruch* ist in jeder Rücksicht ein merkwürdiges Werk Ein Gedicht, wie dieses, konnte nur in Groß-Britannien entstehen, und hat in keiner andern Sprache seinesgleichen. Leider geht für mich und alle Autoctonen und Mesogeotiker, die von Meer, Schiffsbau, Schifffarth, Seesturmen, und nautischen Verrichtungen aller Art keinen Begriff haben, die Hälfte des Gedichtes fast ganz verloren; denn was ich, selbst mit Hülfe der Noten, davon verstehen kann, ist doch nur a *Darkness visible* (mit Milton zu reden), worin ich von der Schönheit, Stärke, Wahrheit und Lebendigkeit der Darstellung nur gerade soviel gewahr werden kann, um zu beklagen, daß ich des vollen Genusses dieser so musterhaften, kunstvollen Bearbeitung eines so ungeschmeidigen Stoffes nicht theilhaftig werden kann, von welchem in einem eminenten Sinn wahr ist, er sey 'cosa non detta in prosa mai nè in rima' Dem ungeachtet unterstehe ich mich von dem Ganzen zu behaupten, daß es an poetischen Verdiensten aller Arten, und besonders an Schönheit der Versification keinem mir bekannten Gedicht in irgend einer Sprache weiche. Es wäre äußerst interessant, zu wissen, wie Mr Falconer zu dieser, außer ihm selbst, beyspielloßen Verbindung so vieler Classischer Gelehrsamkeit und Cultur, mit einer so genauen und intuitiven Kenntniß der nautischen Kunst, gekommen sey.

Vermuthlich, I. Macdonald, ist Ihnen indessen auch die wirklich vortreffliche Übersetzung des Oberons von einem Hrn *Sotheby*<sup>2</sup> (von welchem ich einige nähere Kenntniß zu erhalten begierig bin und vielleicht durch Huttner<sup>3</sup> erhalten werde) zu Gesichte gekommen Da es doch einmal mein Loos ist, übersetzt zu werden, so gestehe ich aufrichtig, es hat mir große Freude gemacht, den Britten so sehr zu meinem Vortheil bekannt zu werden, als es durch diese Übersetzung geschehen wird, die alle Verdienste eines schonen Originals mit seltner Treue und Präcision verbindet.

Von meinem eignen Oberon habe ich vor einigen Wochen eine meisterhafte Recen-

<sup>1</sup> Mscr. Dresd h. 37

<sup>2</sup> Sotheby's *Oberon* was published in 1798. See V Stockley, *German Literature as Known in England, 1750-1830*, London, 1929, pp. 93 ff, where Wieland's opinion of the work is discussed.

<sup>3</sup> Johann Christian Huttner (1766-1847), official interpreter at the Foreign Office. He acted as literary liaison officer between England and the Weimar circle See P. Gedan, *J. C. Huttner*, Leipzig, 1898.

sion und Beurtheilung im *Critical Review* gelesen, deren Verfasser ich zu kennen wunsche<sup>1</sup> Es ist kaum möglich, daß es ein Englishman sey.

Ich weiß nicht wie es kommt, aber seit dem *Sie*, I. Macdonald, wieder in Ihrer Insel sind, ist mir Brittannien auf einmahl wieder lieber geworden—so lieb, daß ich mich über Nelsons Sieg ordentlich wie ein Britte gefreut habe Konnte ein *Kosmopolst* das mit gutem Gewissen? Was Sie mir von Ihren nahen Aussichten und dießfalsigen Entschließungen melden, hat meinen volligsten Beyfall. Ich glaube einen sehr richtigen Begriff von der Lage eines Clergymans in Scotland zu haben, und kenne keinen ehrwürdigern, edlern und einem Mann von Ihrem Geist und Herzen anstandigern Beruf Sich in den Hebriden vergraben zu wollen, konnte ich Ihnen nicht verzeihen Leben Sie wohl, lieber, theurer Macdonald, ruft Ihnen meine ganze Famihe mit mir zu, seyn Sie so glücklich wie wirs Ihnen wünschen, und vergessen *me* Ihres alten Freundes, des Eremiten zu Oßmanstatt.

WIELAND.

A. GILLIES.

HULL.

<sup>1</sup> Wieland is here certainly referring to William Taylor's famous appreciation of *Oberon* in his discussion of Wieland's *Werke*, vols. 21–3, in the *Monthly Review* (2nd Series, **xxiii**, 1797, pp 576–84). The *Critical* did not review *Oberon* in any of the numbers of its *New Series* up to the end of 1798. In that year it did review Sotheby's translation but showed little enthusiasm for Wieland (**xxiv**, pp 58–66)· indeed its general attitude towards him was one of moral indignation (Stockley, p 87 f.). A similar confusion of the two periodicals occurs in the *Neuer Teutscher Merkur*, **ii**, 1799, p. 165 f.



# PROFESSOR J. G. ROBERTSON

## A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

THE interest and importance of the contribution made by the late Professor J G Robertson to the study of modern European literature suggested the compilation of the following list of books and articles by him. The list does not include articles in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* or those written for weekly periodicals, most of which are unsigned, or signed only with initials.

*Zur Kritik Jakob Ayers Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf sein Verhältnis zu Hans Sachs und den englischen Komödianten* Inaugural-Dissertation Leipzig, 1892.

*The Beginnings of the German Novel* in *Westminster Review*, CXLII, 2, August 1894.

*Theodor Storm* in *Gentleman's Magazine*, CCLXXIX, December 1895

*Twenty-Five Years of a German Court Theatre* in *National Review*, xxv, 146, April 1895.

Hartmann von Aue's *Der arme Heinrich*, ed. by J G Robertson London Sonnenschein, 1895.

*Storm's Immensee*, ed by J G Robertson London Sonnenschein, 1895

*Gustav Freytag* in *Scottish Review*, xxvii, January 1896.

*Current German Literature* in *Cosmopolis*, III, August 1896, v, March 1897, and vii, September 1897

*Selections from the Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe*, ed. by J G Robertson. London Ginn and Co, 1898

*The Literary Movement in Germany* in *Cosmopolis*, ix, March 1898, and xii, October 1898

*Goethe and the Nineteenth Century*<sup>1</sup> in *Quarterly Review*, cxcI, January 1900.

*The Oldest Scenes in Faust* in *Modern Language Notes*, xv, 5, May 1900.

*History of German Literature*. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1902.

*Georg Brandes* in *Independent Review*, II, 6, March 1904.

*Schiller after a Century*. Edinburgh and London Blackwood, 1905

*The Knowledge of Shakespeare on the Continent at the beginning of the Eighteenth Century* in *Modern Language Review*, I, 4, July 1906.

*Lessing and Farquhar* in *Modern Language Review*, II, 1, October 1906.

*Literature in Germany* in *Cambridge Modern History*, x, chap. xii. Cambridge University Press, 1907.

*Milton's Fame on the Continent* in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, III. London: Milford, Oxford University Press, 1909.

*Shakespeare on the Continent* in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, v, chap. xii. Cambridge University Press, 1910

*Outlines of the History of German Literature* Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1911

*Lessing and Marmontel* in *Modern Language Review*, vi, 2, April 1911.

*Goethe and the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature). Cambridge University Press, 1912

*Lessing's Nathan der Weise*, ed. by J. G. Robertson (Pitt Press Series). Cambridge University Press, 1912.

*The Literature of Germany* (Home University Library). London: Williams and Norgate [1913].

*Friedrich Hebbel* in *Modern Language Review*, viii, 2, April 1913.

*Notes on Lessing's Beytrage zur Historie und Aufnahme des Theaters* in *Modern Language Review*, viii, 4, October 1913, and ix, 2, April 1914.

*Søren Kierkegaard* in *Modern Language Review*, ix, 4, October 1914.

*Carlyle* in *Cambridge History of English Literature*, xiii, chap. i Cambridge University Press, 1916.

<sup>1</sup> Unsigned.

*Lessing's Interpretation of Aristotle* in *Modern Language Review*, xii, 2, 3, April, July 1917, and xiv, 1, January 1919.

Goethe's *Torquato Tasso*, ed. by J G Robertson Manchester University Press, 1918

*Lessing, Maffer and Calepio* in *Modern Language Review*, xiii, 4, October 1918.

*The New Horizon in European Literature* in *Discovery*, i, 3, March 1920

*New Interpretations of Romanticism* in *Discovery*, i, 11, November 1920.

*Henrik Pontoppidan* in *Contemporary Review*, cxvii, March 1920

*Notes on Lessing's Hamburgische Dramaturgie I The Plays of the Hamburg Repertory* in *Modern Language Review*, xv, 4, October 1920

*Carl Spitteler* in *Contemporary Review*, cxix, January 1921.

*Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris* Some new points of view in *Publications of the English Goethe Society* New Series, i London Alex Moring, 1924

*Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century* Cambridge University Press, 1923.

*The Genesis of Wagner's Drama Tannhauser* in *Modern Language Review*, xviii, 4, October 1923.

*The Gods of Greece in German Poetry* (Taylorian Lecture) Oxford Clarendon Press, 1924

*The Reconciliation of Classic and Romantic* (Presidential Address to the Modern Humanities Research Association 1924-5.) *Publications of the M H R A* 8. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1925.

*Goethe and Byron.* *Publications of the English Goethe Society* New Series, ii London Alex Moring, 1925.

*The Movement of Ideas in Modern German Literature* in *Modern Languages*, vii, 3-4, February 1926.

*Goethe* (Republic of Letters.) London Routledge, 1927.

*Henrik Ibsen* in *Contemporary Review*, cxxxiii, April 1928

*The Tragedy of Goethe's Tasso* in *Publications of the English Goethe Society.* New Series, v London: Alex Moring, 1928

*Scandinavia in Contemporary Movements in European Literature* [chap. vii], ed. by W Rose and J. Isaacs. London: Routledge, 1928.

*Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in Essays by Divers Hands. Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature.* New Series, ix. London Milford, Oxford University Press, 1930

*Lessing's Criticism of the French Drama* Some Sources in *Mélanges Baldensperger*, ii. Paris. Champion, 1930.

*History of German Literature.* New and Revised Edition. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1931

Introduction to Strindberg's *Master Olof and Other Plays.* (Anglo-Swedish Literary Foundation) London Jonathan Cape, 1931.

*The Life and Work of Goethe* London Routledge, 1932

*Sophie von La Roche's Visit to England in 1786* in *Modern Language Review*, xxvii, 2, April 1932.

*Goethe und England* in *Jahrbuch der Goethe Gesellschaft*, xviii, 1932.

*Goethe und England* in *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, xx, 1932

*The Centenary of Goethe's Death* in *Essays by Divers Hands* *Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature* New Series, xii. London: Milford, Oxford University Press, 1933

*Charles Harold Herford. 1853-1931. Proceedings of the British Academy*, xvii. London. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1933.

In preparation:

*Lessing's Dramatic Theory* *Being an Introduction to and Commentary on his Hamburgische Dramaturgie.*

*Essays and Addresses on Literature.*

E. PURDIE.

LONDON.

## MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

### SIR HENRY LEE'S ENTERTAINMENT OF ELIZABETH IN 1592.

During the progress of 1592 a dramatic entertainment was given before Elizabeth at one of Sir Henry Lee's houses. Professor Bond<sup>1</sup> assumed that the place of performance was Quarrendon, during the Queen's two days' visit in August, but Sir Edmund Chambers<sup>2</sup> has pointed out that *An Excellent Dialogue between Constancie and Inconstancie* (which formed part of the entertainment) is expressly described in the Inner Temple Petyt MS.<sup>3</sup> as 'spoken before the Queenes Majestie at Woodstock.' He has therefore assumed that the entertainment was given during the royal visit to Woodstock of September 18-23, either at one of Lee's lodges or at his Ditchley house. This conclusion has been confirmed by the testimony of a manuscript of *Sir Henry Lee's Devices*, formerly preserved at Ditchley and now in the British Museum<sup>4</sup>. There the dates September 20 and 21, 1592, are given before certain portions of the entertainment. Sir Edmund Chambers knew of the existence of this manuscript<sup>5</sup>, but apparently had not seen it.

In order to make it clear what new information is provided by the British Museum manuscript, I shall first give a list of Sir Henry Lee's devices for Elizabeth contained in the Ferrers MS., as enumerated by Sir Edmund Chambers.

(1) *A Cartell for a Challeng*; evidently for a tilt; dated by Chambers 'earlier than 1590.'

(2) *Sir Henry Lee's challenge before the Champanne*; again for the tilt; dated by Chambers 1585.

(3) *The Supplication of the Owld Knight*; for the tilt; dated by Chambers 'later than 1590.'

(4) *The Message of the Damsell of the Queene of Fayries*; regarded by Chambers as written for a tilt soon after 1575.

(5) *The Olde Knightes Tale*; according to Chambers, either part of the Woodstock entertainment of 1575 or near to it in time.

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, I, pp. 526-7.

<sup>2</sup> *The Elizabethan Stage*, III, p. 407.

<sup>3</sup> 538, 43, f. 299.

<sup>4</sup> Add. 41,499, which consists of the original manuscript (A) and a modern transcript (B). I have been led to an examination of this uncatalogued manuscript by a pencilled marginal note in one of the British Museum copies of *The Elizabethan Stage* (III, p. 405).

<sup>5</sup> *The Elizabethan Stage*, III, pp. 404, 407.

(6) *The Songe after Dinner at the two Ladies entrance*; part of the 1592 entertainment.

(7) *The Ladies Thankesgeuving for theire Deluerie from Unconstancie*, part of the 1592 entertainment.

(8) *The last Songe*; part of the 1592 entertainment.

(9) *The second dares woorkes where the Chaplayne maketh this Relation*; part of the 1592 entertainment.

(10) *The Page bringeth tydings of his Maister's Recouerie & presenteth his Legacie*; part of the 1592 entertainment.

There is also in the Petyt MS

(11) *The melancholie Knights complaint in the wood*; part of the 1592 entertainment.

Professor Bond, not knowing of (11), assigned (4)–(10) to Lyly and regarded them as part of a single entertainment<sup>1</sup>. Sir Edmund Chambers does not accept Lyly's authorship, pointing out that (7) and (11) are ascribed in the manuscripts to 'Doctor Edes,' and thinks that only (6)–(11) belonged to the 1592 entertainment.

The British Museum manuscript contains

(1), (2), (3) and (4) as listed by Chambers.

(5) The speech of a hermit, telling of a knight who has left the court and lived in retirement, but who is now come with some rustic followers to celebrate November 17, this clearly for a tilt.

(6) After a missing leaf, a hermit's speech—imperfect at the beginning—which is *The tale of Hemetes the heremyte* from the 1575 Woodstock entertainment<sup>2</sup>.

(7) A speech *Written at the erle of Arundels desier at his challenge*, and various other devices for the tilt.

(8) After a second missing leaf, part of a letter with verses appended. It is dated 'the 3 Kallender of october 1575.'

(9) Evidently a speech in an entertainment at Lee's house. '... This high place, w<sup>ch</sup> shewinge you much and many, shewes yo<sup>u</sup> nothing but yo<sup>r</sup> owne, belongs to a solitarie knight .'.', according to the speaker, two knights have come thither, respectively attacking and praising love: Elizabeth perhaps may set them at concord. The speech is signed 'I : g :.'

(10) [*The pedlers [t]ale at her M<sup>ties</sup> being at heneage house*; the speaker, 'Pers passer the pedler,' tells of his dispute with a fair lady in Athens: she has discountenanced his enthusiasm for travel and for the great figures of antiquity.

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. MS. Royal 18A, xlviii and *The Elizabethan Stage*, III, p. 401.

(11) After another missing leaf, a prose attack on rebels, with no indication of its immediate purpose.

(12) A speech in praise of Elizabeth, by one dressed as a shepherd, possibly for a tilt.

(13) Latin verses in praise of Elizabeth, and an *Epilogus Caesaris interfecti*; the verses are quoted in Segar's *Honor, Military and Civill*<sup>1</sup> as being used at the tilt on November 17, 1590.

(14) 1592. September 20. *The Knight that had Charge of the groue* a warning to 'Ladye or queene or both' not to enter the grove which

yealds nothunge els but sighes & mornfull songs  
of hopeles people by ther haples tryall

(15) *The second Knights Complaynt*, this is the same as (11) in Chambers's list

(16) [*The mard*]ens song, in which both men and women are charged with inconstancy.

(17) *The thurd Knights songe*, which again describes the inhabitants of the grove.

(18) *The Knight that had the Charge of the groue*. a prose speech; Elizabeth has apparently passed through the grove, and the knight is taking leave of her, he recites some Latin echo verses, which express the lamentations of one of the knights in the grove.

(19) *The page*; a verse speech which draws attention to 'thos charmed picturs on the wall depending'; if their riddle can be solved, his master may be released. This is clearly addressed to the Queen, and is part of the same entertainment as *The Olde Knightes Tale*—(5) in Chambers's list—which immediately follows it in this manuscript.

(20), (21), (22) and (23) corresponding to (5), (6), (7) and (8) in Chambers.

(24) and (25) corresponding to (9) and (10) in Chambers, but run together because another leaf is missing; the date '1592 Septe 21<sup>th</sup>' is prefixed.

(26) In a new hand, a sermon on *The zealous mans Teares*.

(1)–(5), (7), (12) and part of (13) seem to be connected with Lee's activities on November 17. (6) is certainly part of the 1575 Woodstock entertainment, and other entertainments of unknown date are represented by (9), (10), (19) and (20)<sup>2</sup>. (8), (11) and (26) do not seem to be connected with entertainments, and we can regard all the remaining items in the manuscript as parts of the 1592 entertainment at Ditchley. Of these, (14), (16), (17) and (18) have not previously been known.

<sup>1</sup> Bk III, cap 54.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Bond included our (4) and (20) in the 1592 entertainment, but there is no evidence for this.

The first part of the entertainment on September 20 was presumably given in the open air. 'The Knight that had Charge of the groue' warned the Queen of the dangers of the place (14), but she entered and heard *The second Knights Complaynt* (15). He told her that the grove was inhabited by 'light harted ladies, heavy harted Knights'. There followed [*The mard*]ens song (16) and *The thurd Knights songe* (17), and lastly the prose speech of the guardian knight (18). That probably concluded the daytime's entertainment, but the same theme of inconstancy was introduced within doors after dinner. First, there was *The song at the ladies thangkgeunge* (21), which begins

To that grace that settis vs free  
ladies let vs thanckfull be.

This clearly suggests that the power of Elizabeth had freed them from the Grove of Inconstancy. Then there was *The ladies thancksgewunge for ther delyuery from vnconstancie* (22), which, after an introductory speech, takes the form of a debate between Constancy and Liberty in which Constancy subdues her opponent. *The song at ther depture* (23) concluded the proceedings.

On the next day, September 21, the Chaplain announced that the knight Loricus was at the point of death and had addressed his will to the Queen (24). The Page, however, came to declare that Loricus had sufficiently recovered to add a codicil (25) 'Item. I bequethe (to your Highnes) THE WHOLE MANNOR OF LOUE, & the appurtenaunces thereunto belonging . . .'. Loricus, as a dramatic disguise for Sir Henry Lee, appeared in the 1575 Woodstock entertainment, which is referred to indirectly in the first lines of the Chaplain's speech.

This second day's entertainment is slight enough, and it may well be that Lee employed more devices than have survived in the manuscript. The outline of each day's proceedings, however, is now clear.

CLIFFORD LEECH.

SWANSEA.

#### PRESTER JOHN IN COLERIDGE'S 'KUBLA KHAN.'

One of the most interesting problems that arises in connexion with *Kubla Khan* is the manner in which the background of the unfinished poem seems to be ever changing. Xanadu and Kubla Khan take us to the frontiers of North-western China, while the 'Abyssinian maid,' Mount Abora and 'Alph the sacred river' (if we may see in the name an allusion to the Alpheus, applied to the sources of the Nile) carry us

<sup>1</sup> This *Legacye* does not appear in the British Museum manuscript.

away to North-eastern Africa, two lands as far apart geographically and as different racially and climatically as any we can imagine. And naturally, as we read, we are led to seek the connecting link between the two in Coleridge's mind.

Professor J. L. Lowes, in his excellent study of the genesis of *Kubla Khan*, *The Road to Xanadu* (p. 373), says:

Why was the damsel with a dulcimer 'an Abyssinian maid'? The answer is not far to seek. The fountains of the sacred river are in Abyssinia, almost from beginning to end the scene of Bruce's narrative is laid in Abyssinia; and Abyssinia hovered in the background of the vision, *to become suddenly explicit in this seemingly unaccountable detail*. And for another instant Abyssinia held the foreground of the dream.

Professor Lowes has, just previously, explained the appearance of the Nile—'Alph the sacred river'—in a scene laid in Eastern Asia by the fact that Coleridge knew and, 'on the Christmas Eve of 1794,' had used James Bruce's *Travels to discover the Sources of the Nile* in his *Religious Musings*. With this we agree in so far as concerns the Nile; but why should Purchas's description of Kublai Khan's 'house of pleasure' in Xamdu cause immediate associations with Abyssinia in Coleridge's dream? Three years had probably elapsed (if we are to re-date *Kubla Khan* as written 'in the summer of' 1798) since Bruce's work had occupied his attention. Can we find no other *atome crochu* of much more recent date? We might say of *immediate* date, for we feel convinced that another reason may be adduced to explain the immediate blending of the Nile, as seen without a shadow of doubt through Bruce's work, with the scene evoked by Purchas; and it seems to us that that link does exist in the very book which Coleridge had been reading and within a few pages of the passage which he himself quotes.

If we turn to the *Pilgrimages* and read the twenty pages which precede the reference to Xamdu (on p. 472), we find the following passages<sup>1</sup>:

<sup>2</sup>M. Paulus... saith that they [the Tartars] dwelled at first (if such wandring may be so called) in the North, where they had no Lord ouer them, but payed tribute to a great Signor (*there called Vncam, and here in these Countreys Presbyter Iohn*), to whom they payed the tenth of their beasts. But this Vncam, or *Presbyter Iohn* fearing their numbers euery where multiplying, deuised to disperse them through the World: which the Tartars perceiuing, with joynt consent forsooke their former habitation, and departed thence farre off into the North, denying further tribute unto Vncam.

After they had there continued a certayne time, they chose to their King about the yeere 1162. one which was called *Cingus Can*, who ruled them with such modestie and iustice, that they loued and feared him as a god, his fame reducing all the other

<sup>1</sup> Quotations are from the 1617 edition of the *Pilgrimages*, a copy of which was consulted in the Bristol Central Library (not, apparently, the copy used by Coleridge, according to records now in the Bristol Central Library, Coleridge does not appear to have borrowed a copy of Purchas from the King Street Library).

<sup>2</sup> Quotations are as in the text, save that italics are used throughout to emphasise points of particular importance only.

Tartars in other parts vnder his obedience He thus strengthened, wearie of those desarts, commanded them to arme themselues with bowes, and other weapons, and began to inuade and conquer Cities and Prouinces to his subiection, the principall inhabitants whereof he carried with him, kindly entertayning them, leauing such discreet Gouvernours in the same, that the people were secured in their persons and goods. When he had thus subdued about nine Prouinces, *he sent his Ambassador to Vncam, to demand his daughter in marriage, which Vncam with much indignation and many threatnings denying, Cingis assembling his forces, marched against him, and by the way enquired of his Astrologers and Diurners touching his successe . . . Cingis his reed over-coming the other, as after Cingis himselfe did Vncam, whom he slew in the field, and possessed his daughter and state . . .* (p 454)

After the conquest of Cathay, *Cingis sent his sonne Thossut Can (for so they termed him also) against the people of Comania, whom hee vanquished Another sonne he sent against the Indians, who subdued India Minor These Indians are the black Saracens, which are also called Ethiopians Thence he marched to fight against Christians, dwelling in India Mavor, whose King was commonly called Presbyter Iohn . . .* (p 457)

...our moderne Mappes haue caused no small scruple to a dilgent obseruer, in placing Cathay a countrey reported to be so fertile and ciuill in so Northerly a clime, very indiscreetly raysing Cambalu to the height of sixty degrees, and paralleling Cathay with Norway: which cannot stand with other things thereof reported, howsoeuer the Tartars themselves were happily of a more Northerly climate then this mentioned Others goe not so farre, yet they place Cambalu too farre within land, which Paulus saith is within two dayes journey of the Sea . And herein participate other great and mighty Princes, Prester Iohn (so called) of *Æthiopia in Africa . . .* (p 464)

Surely we may presume that Coleridge, who had 'read everything,' as he says, had explored the legends that had sprung up in the Middle Ages around the name of this mysterious personage, Prester John. *Kubla Khan* is there to prove that he had not remained unresponsive to the magic power of that name; and, even supposing that he knew nothing about the legends, surely there is sufficient in our three quotations to account for the ever-changing scene in which *Kubla Khan* is laid.

Marco Polo's report of a Christian kingdom in India named Abascia or a conjecture of a Portuguese traveller, Peter Covillanus, in the fifteenth century, appears to be responsible for the theory that the land ruled by Prester John was Abyssinia. But Coleridge knew and made use of the *Pilgrimes* as well<sup>1</sup>. A perusal of the longer work will show that the name of Prester John is to be found in Parts I, II and III, and that, further, Purchas, no less than his sources, tends to make no distinction between the rulers of Abyssinia (or *Æthiopia*, as he has it) and the Kings of Tenduc. In Parts I and II, the references are obviously to Abyssinian monarchs<sup>2</sup>:

The King [of Socatra] hath some knowledge of *Prester Iohn*; confessing him to be the greatest Prince in the World . . . (I, p. 540).

<sup>1</sup> This work, as Professor Lowes shows, provides certain details of the gardens and the prototype of the 'damsel with a dulcimer' in the account of the Old Man of the Mountains (*The Road to Xanadu*, pp 360-4).

<sup>2</sup> Quotations are here from the 1625 edition of the *Pilgrimes* (also consulted in a copy kept in the Bristol Central Library).



*Preste Iohn*, by name Atını Tingill. . reigning in the yeare 1530, in the Land of *Æthiopia* . . . fel into an vniuersall hatred of the *Abezmes* . . . (II, p 1128)

A Faithfull and good Christian, called Onadinguell, being *Emperour* in the Kingdome of *Ethiopia* (vulgarly called *Presbyter Iohn*) . . . (II, p 1149)

An *Armenian* his report of *svssinvs*, the *Emperour* of the *Abazins*, by vs vulgarly called *PRESTER IOHN*. (Title to sub-section) (II, p 1187).

In Part III we find the following passages, which, equally obviously, refer to the rulers of Tenduc

They [the Tartars] had not a Prince of their Nation, but payed tribute to a certayne great King, named as I haue heard, in their language *Vmcan* (*sic*), which in some mens opinion in our tongue signifieth, *Presbyter* (or *Priest*) *Iohn*<sup>1</sup> (III, p 77)

Going to the East from the Prouince *Egrigaa*, the way leadeth unto *The Prouince Tenduch*, in the which are many Cities and Castles where also *Presbyter Iohannes* useth to abide, who now payeth tribute to great Chan *This King* of the progenie of *Priest Iohn* is named *George*, and is a *Priest* and a *Christian*, and most of the people are *Christians* All the Great Chans, after his death who was slaine in battell by *Cingis*, gaue their daughters to those kings to wife<sup>2</sup> (III, p 80).

It is in Part III also that we find (pp. 137-8, misprinted as pp. 157-8), quoted in the Latin text of the *Travels and Observations of Sir John Mandeville*, the legend of *Prester John* and *Oger the Dane*

If we now return to p. 472 of the *Pilgrimages*, we shall find that the passage immediately preceding that which contains the reference to *Xamdu* deals with the marriage customs of the Tartars.

When they marry, the Husband couenanteth with the Father of the Maide, who hauing giuen him power to take her wheresoeuer hee shall finde her, hee seeketh her among some of her friends, where she hath then of purpose hidden her selfe, and by a kinde of force carrieth her away. . . .

May we not say that, even as Coleridge began to read *Purchas's* description of *Xamdu*, the reference to the marriage customs of the Tartars was sufficient to call vividly into his mind the manner in which *Jenghiz Khan* had slain *Prester John* and possessed himself of his daughter and state? And with the name of *Prester John* would come up the impressions received from the passages in the *Pilgrimages*, fairly clearly defined, and behind them, with their implicit confusion of the rulers of *Abyssinia* with the sometime overlord of the Tartars and his descendants, the various references to that ubiquitous figure scattered throughout the first three parts of the *Pilgrimes*, less distinct, but sufficient to operate that miraculous fusion. Such, surely, is the shadow-personage who hovers in the background of *Kubla Khan*, conveying us on the magic carpet of the poet's imagination from *Xanadu* to *Abyssinia* and the Nile.

F. J. WARNE.

BRISTOL

<sup>1</sup> This passage is followed by the story of *Prester John* and *Jenghiz Khan*, related in more detail than in the *Pilgrimages*.

<sup>2</sup> *Marco Polo*, the authority for this statement, says: ' . . . It is a custom, I may tell you, that these kings of the lineage of *Prester John* always obtain to wife either daughters of the Great Kaan or other princesses of his family.' (Yule, *Travels of Ser Marco Polo*, I, p. 284.)

## A LETTER OF JOHANN GEORG ZIMMERMANN.

The following letter was written when Zimmermann was at the height of his fame as a physician and author. A Swiss by birth, he had been living in Hanover since 1768 as 'Physician to His Britannic Majesty George III,' and his medical advice had been sought by many crowned heads, including the Empress Catherine II of Russia and Frederick the Great, whom he attended in his last illness. He had enjoyed the satisfaction of seeing English and French translations of his books going through numerous editions<sup>1</sup> and of counting among his friends and correspondents some of the most distinguished men of his time—Bodmer, Haller, Lavater, Wieland, Herder and Goethe. Many of his letters have been printed<sup>2</sup>, and I am glad to be able to add one to their number.

Hannover 6 März 1789

Jede Gelegenheit da ich Ihnen, mein hochstverehrter und lebenswürdiger Herr Landsmann, auch nur die allergeringste Gefälligkeit erzeugen kann, ist mir höchst willkommen

Ein junger Arzt, den Sie mir empfehlen, ist mir besser empfohlen als wenn er mir selbst bekannt wäre.

Aber bey allen diesen Gesinnungen wird es mir doch ausserst schwer werden Ihrem Freunde dem Herrn Stieglitz zu der Stelle zu verhelfen die Er hier in Hannover sucht. Ich stehe nicht in der allergeringsten Verbindung mit der hiesigen Judenschaft. Dieses Volk hat mir zwar viele Neigung und Zutrauen in Hannover bezeuget, aber diese Neigung und dieses Zutrauen ward mir gar oft allzulastig und allzunangenehm, und darum entfernte ich mich von diesem Volke

Sie sehen also, mein geliebter Herr Landsmann, dass mein Wort bey den Hannoverischen Israeliten von keiner Bedeutung seyn kann

Indessen will ich versuchen was möglich ist. Ich werde an den *grossten* Mann (alles was *reich* ist, nennen die Juden *gross*) unter den hiesigen Juden, den Kammeragenten Michel David, schreiben und ihm Herrn Stieglitz dringend empfehlen. Der Kammeragent fuhrte hier, weil Er 500,000 Thaler commandirt, das grosste Wort.

Aber vorerst sagen Sie mir: ist Herr Stieglitz Doctor? Wo, und wie lange hat Er die Arzneykunst ausgeübt?

Noch immer erinnere ich mir den schönen Abend den ich an Ihrer Seite in unsers vortreflichen Blumenbachs Hause zugebracht habe mit zärtlichstem Danke. Danken Sie doch nun auch, in meinem Namen, diesem sinnreichen und geistvollen Manne für seine in diesen Tagen mir geschenkte Schrift über den Bildungstrieb, und grüssen Sie ihn von mir herzlichst<sup>3</sup>

Mit nächster Post erwarte ich von Ihnen, mein geliebter und unvergesslicher Herr Landsmann, Antwort

J. G. Zimmermann

<sup>1</sup> See B. Q. Morgan, *A Bibliography of German Literature in English Translations*, Madison, 1922. V Stockley, *German Literature as known in England 1750-1830*, London, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> Albrecht Rengger, *J. G. Zimmermanns Briefe an einige seiner Freunde in der Schweiz*, Aarau, 1830 Ulrich Hegner, *Beiträge zur nähern Kenntnis J. K. Lavaters Aus Briefen seiner Freunde an ihn*, Leipzig, 1836 *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, xxv (1904), p. 217. Hermann Schollenberger, *Ein Brief Zimmermanns (Euphorion)*, 13 *Ergänzungsheft*, 1921 Alfred Bergmann, *Zwei Briefe Johann Georg Zimmermanns (Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kypenberg)*, v, Leipzig, 1925).

<sup>3</sup> Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1840), generally considered the founder of anthropology, was Professor of Medicine in the University of Göttingen from 1778 to his death. The work referred to, *Über den Bildungstrieb und das Zeugungsgeschäft*, appeared in Göttingen, 1781, second edition 1788

Unfortunately we do not know to whom the letter was written. That he was a Swiss of some distinction and an old and intimate friend is evident from the terms which Zimmermann employs in addressing him. 'mein höchstverehrter und lebenswürdiger Herr Landsmann,' 'mein geliebter Herr Landsmann,' 'mein geliebter und unvergesslicher Herr Landsmann', and Zimmermann's reference to having met him in the house of Professor Blumenbach in Göttingen should help to identify him.

Of Zimmermann's more notable Swiss friends only two, Johann Heinrich Fussli and Johann Kaspar Lavater, were still living in 1789, the date of the letter. Both visited Göttingen several times and may easily have met Zimmermann there. However, as we know from Zimmermann's published correspondence that he addressed Lavater as *Du*, our letter in which the formal *Sie* is used cannot have been written to him. Moreover, the fact that the letter turned up in London adds to the probability that the recipient was Fussli, who had settled in England and there won fame and position<sup>1</sup>. That Zimmermann had been following Fussli's career with great interest and held him in high esteem both as a poet and painter is seen from the letter he wrote to Herder in April, 1775<sup>2</sup> 'Fussli ist der kühnste Gedankenwerfer, den ich kenne. Ich habe Oden von ihm gelesen, gegen die viele von Klopstocks Oden Wasser sind. Vor einigen Jahren sagten die grössten Maler in London, er dürfe nur nach Rom gehen um in der Zeichnung Raffael zu werden.' Then, referring to a letter in which Fussli with unbounded self-confidence had belittled Klopstock's achievements, Zimmermann continued. 'Sein Brief an Lavater vom März 1775 hat mich unendlich vergnügt. Das ist ein Ton nach meinem Herzen. Aber wenigen Menschen unter Millionen kommt es zu aus diesem Ton zu sprechen, nur Fussli, Ihnen, Lavater und Goethe.'

H. G. FIEDLER.

OXFORD

<sup>1</sup> Johann Heinrich Fussli (1741-1825), a native of Zurich, came to England in 1763. In 1774 he went to Italy where he remained till 1778, changing his name to Fuseli. He published poems, lectures on art and translations of some of Lavater's and Winckelmann's writings, besides painting some two hundred pictures. He was made a R.A. in 1790, and on Sir Joshua Reynolds' death in 1792 became Professor of painting to the Academy. He was buried in St Paul's Cathedral. See John Knowles, F.R.S., *The Life and Writings of Henry Fuseli*, London, 1831, 3 vols.

Thus and the articles in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and the *Deutsche Allgemeine Biographie* have been superseded by Arnold Feldmann, *J. H. Fussli, Dichter und Maler*, Zurich and Leipzig, 1927.

<sup>2</sup> First printed by H. Duntzer in *Aus Herders Nachlass* (Frankfurt a/Main, 1856), II, p. 348.

A NOTE ON GOETHE AS A TRANSLATOR OF  
ENGLISH PROSE, 1820-1832.

In his essays, introductions and fragments, collected as *Aufsätze zur Literatur* (W. Ed. I, 42, 1/2), Goethe has several longer or shorter translations from English prose. These give occasional interesting sidelights on Goethe's technique of translation, especially on the type of error he was inclined to make. Most of these passages come from Carlyle, there are, however, other longer ones from Sir Walter Scott and from an anonymous writer in the *Quarterly Review*. The passages in question are:

(1) Anon. *Quarterly Review*, XLVII, Dec. 1820, p. 87 (cf. W. Ed. I, 42, 1, pp. 158 ff. in *Theilnahme Goethes an Manzoni*).

(2) Scott, Sir Walter: Extract from *On the Supernatural in Fictitious Composition* in *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, I, July 1827, pp. 96 f. (cf. W. Ed. I, 42, 2, pp. 87 f.).

(3a) Carlyle, T. in Norton, C. E., *Correspondence between Goethe and Carlyle* (London, 1887), p. 124 (cf. W. Ed. I, 42, 1, pp. 191 ff.).

(b) Carlyle, T.: in Norton, p. 123 (cf. W. Ed. I, 42, 1, pp. 196 f.).

(c) Carlyle, T.: in Norton, p. 161 (cf. W. Ed. I, 42, 1, pp. 204 ff.).

(4) Carlyle, T.. *Essay on Burns* in *Edinburgh Review*, XLVIII, Dec. 1828, pp. 271, 272, lines 6 ff. (cf. W. Ed. I, 42, 1, pp. 198 ff.)<sup>1</sup>.

The main difficulty in examining the translations is that in several cases it is doubtful to whom the discrepancy between the manuscript and the final printed form is to be ascribed<sup>2</sup>, while in others Riemer's hand has corrected Goethe's work so carefully that it is uncertain whether the passage has any value for our purpose<sup>3</sup>. In the analysis I give below and which does not pretend to be exhaustive there occur, of course, several cases where only my subjective judgment decided whether an observation should be treated and where it should appear.

In his choice of German equivalents for English words Goethe is almost as often merely inexact in such a way as not to distort the meaning of a passage as he is definitely wrong. When he is inexact, however, his German expression is usually neither so colourful nor so pregnant as the English one, e.g.:

Substantives: CB 200, 8 'hoar visage,' 'wilde Anblick'; CB 200, 11 'tempest,' 'Wind'; CB 202, 1 'darkest despondency,' 'dusterste Zustände.'

Adjectives: CG 192, 6 'swift (horses),' 'leichte (Pferde)'; CG 196, 18

<sup>1</sup> The following contractions are used. (1) is referred to as M, (2) as S, (3a-c) as CG and (4) as CB.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. Ed. I, 42, 1, p. 509.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 519.

'wasted away,' 'zu Grunde gerichtet', CB 199, 17 'queenlike,' 'vornehm', CB 199, 19 'torn asunder,' 'zerstört.'

Verbs S 88, 13 'soaring,' 'sich bewegend'; CG 205, 10f 'dazzle,' 'zu stark sein', CB 199, 27 'which might have soared,' 'der sich erhoben hätte.'

There are very few examples of the opposite tendency, e.g.:

M 160, 12 'affecting,' 'herzergreifend'; CB 199, 3 'lays down before us,' 'reicht uns'; CB 201, 6 'softened and brightened,' 'gesanftigt und verherrlicht'

There are several cases of inexact or seemingly inexact translation which show us Goethe's background of thought working upon and affecting his choice of vocabulary. CG 191, 25f 'professional appointment,' 'Lehrstelle' is perhaps a memory of the testimonial Goethe sent to Carlyle for his application for the Chair of Moral Philosophy in the University of St Andrews<sup>1</sup>. M 159, 2f. 'tramontane,' 'nordisch' is a key to the meaning for Goethe of a word which has gained a great variety of meanings in the course of a century. CG 191, 11 'considerable,' 'bedeutend' and CB 199, 24f 'ignorance,' 'Beschränktheit' are examples of the use by Goethe of favourite words of his own when the context does not completely warrant it<sup>2</sup>. In CG 196, 17 'in the rank of a peasant,' 'in der tiefsten Classe der Landleute' and CB 201, 12f. 'peasant Poet,' 'dieser poetische Landmann' Goethe has failed to appreciate the exact meaning conveyed by the word 'peasant' to the Scot, Carlyle, erring on the one side towards contempt and on the other towards pastoral idealisation.

It is interesting to note that Goethe does not follow Luther's translation, '... gehest auf den Fittichen des Windes,' in his rendering of Carlyle's quotation, 'walketh upon the wings of the wind' (Ps civ 3) but gives one of his own, 'der auf den Schwingen des Windes einherschreitet' (CB 200, 14f.).

A large number of Goethe's real errors in vocabulary are 'Dictionary Translations'; he uses an equivalent of an English word which on certain occasions would be right but which is wrong in the particular context. I do not, of course, mean to infer that Goethe used a dictionary and used it carelessly. Examples of such errors—the most striking being the mis-translations of 'standard' and 'view'—are:

Substantives: CG 196, 17 'by the complexities of his strange situation,' 'durch die Verwicklungen sonderbarer Lagen'; CB 198, 21f. 'standard of beauty,' 'das *Panier* der Schönheit', CB 199, 2f 'into the general view,'

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Boyd, James, *Goethe's knowledge of English Literature* (Oxford, 1932), p. 242

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Article *Bedeutend* in Grimm's *Wörterbuch* and Boucke, E. A., *Wort und Bedeutung in Goethes Sprache* (Berlin, 1901), pp 24ff and *passim*.

'zu allgemeinen *Ansichten*', CB 200, 24f. 'smoke and soil (of a too harsh reality)', 'in dem Rauche, in dem unebenen *Tennenboden*<sup>1</sup>.'

Verbs CB 198, 16 'if he *accomplished* aught,' 'nach hoher *Bildung* strebend', CB 202, 2f 'unbosoms himself,' 'seinen *Busen* aufschliesst.'

Pronoun CB 201, 27 'as *it* were,' 'wie *sie* auch seien.'

To the 'Dictionary Translations' come several errors due to the deceptive similarity of an English word to a German one. Goethe knows one component of a word and this leads him to suppose that he knows the whole word or to guess the components he does not know, e.g..

Substantives. CG 191, 21 f. 'only the *hardest* breeds of sheep,' '*hartwollge* Schafe', CG 192, 24 'mail-coach,' 'Lohnkutsche', CG 205, 4 'stronghold,' 'Haltpunct'; CG 205, 15 'helpfulness,' 'Hulfeleistung'; CB 200, 17 'fellow-feeling,' 'Gleichheitsgefühl', CB 202, 8 'hollowness,' 'Tiefen.'

Adjective: S 87, 18f. 'lighththeaded patient,' 'eines leichtbeweglichen kranken Gehirns.'

Other errors are due to mistaking the meaning of a word on account of similarity of pronunciation, there being occasionally no etymological similarity. Such are:

Substantive CG 191, 22 'moorfowl,' 'Seemoven' (Goethe's train of thought probably went over a 'Meervogel').

Verbs: CB 198, 26 '*trans* himself,' '*drangt* sich', CB 199, 2 '*struggles* forward,' '*strauchelt* vorwärts.'

Pronoun: CG 193, 4 'from *any* of our heights,' 'von *einigen* unserer Hohen'

Adverb CG 191, 16 'almost,' 'meist.'

A few errors are caused by Goethe being misled by a Latin or Romance word, e g

Substantives S 87, 23 'inspirations,' 'Begeisterungen'; CB 198, 27 'to intellectual *expertness*,' 'zu verstandiger *Erfahrung*', CB 201, 18 'pretensions of (wealth),' 'Vorurtheil auf. '; and perhaps CB 198, 23 'impediments,' 'Lasten.'

CG 193, 5 'eastward,' 'westwärts' is a slip The errors CG 191, 11 f. 'on the Scottish *border*,' 'in dem schottischen *Geschäftskreis*,' CG 192, 15 'motive,' 'Gesinnung,' CB 200, 26 'reality,' 'Wirthlichkeit,' CB 201, 21 'thrive,' 'wagen' defy explanation, unless 'reality,' 'Wirthlichkeit' be due to a misprint or to the mistake of an amanuensis writing to dictation.

The other aspects of Goethe's translation are not so rich in peculiarities

<sup>1</sup> The idea of 'unebenen Tennenboden' came from Riemer, Goethe originally wrote 'in Rauch und Boden'

as his choice of words. He does, however, do away with many expressions which, in his originals, tend to make the prose less straightforward and definite. A good example is: CG 192, 9ff. 'That exercise, which I am very fond of, is *almost my sole* amusement; for this is *one of the most solitary* spots in Britain.. It *might* have suited Rousseau *almost as well* as his Island of St Pierre; indeed I find that *most of my* city friends. ' : 'Diese tägliche Bewegung, der ich sehr ergeben bin, ist meine *einzig* Zerstreuung, denn dieser Winkel ist der *einsamste* in Britannien, . . Hier wurde sich Rousseau *eben so gut* gefallen haben als auf seiner Insel St Pierre. Furwahr *meine* städtischen Freunde. . ' Others are the omission of 'we cannot help considering' (S 87, 25), 'yet situated as he was' (S 88, 1), '(a mind) which we cannot help regarding as diseased' (S 88, 8) and 'I find that' (CG 192, 14). A few examples of the opposite tendency are also to be found, e.g.: CG 193, 4f. 'a day's journey,' 'ungefahr eine Tagereise'; CB 201, 7 'not in the highest,' 'kaum in dem Höchsten.'

Finally there are several changes which take Goethe well on the way from translation to adaptation. Probably because he felt it was unsuitable to make public bitter and pessimistic utterances from a private letter he turns 'that I might not have to write for bread, might not be tempted to tell lies for money' into '(allein zu dem Zweck,) meine Lebensweise zu vereinfachen und eine Unabhängigkeit zu erwerben, damit ich mir selbst treu bleiben könne' (CG 192, 16ff.) and 'but if I sink into folly, myself and not my situation will be to blame. Nevertheless.. ' into 'Doch wo gerath' ich hin ' Lassen Sie mich noch gestehen...' (CG 193, 9f.). In adding 'Auch an alterthumlichen Studien fehlt es nicht' (CG 193, 3), Goethe showed that he felt the necessity of a gradual transition from Carlyle's rather derogatory remarks on contemporary critical literature to his mention of local Roman antiquities, and the omission, CG 196, 25, of the passage comparing Schiller unfavourably with Burns is natural and tactful in view of the fact that Goethe was making his translation for the preface of the German edition of Carlyle's own *Life of Schiller*.

DUNCAN M. MENNIE.

ABERDEEN.

## AN UNPUBLISHED POEM ON GOETHE.

In Goedeke's<sup>1</sup> list of Heinrich Doering's<sup>2</sup> works is an unpublished<sup>3</sup> poem entitled *Die Wunderblume*, the theme of which is an imaginary meeting in a Harz mountain inn between the youthful Goethe<sup>4</sup> and the somewhat older Mayer Anselm Rothschild<sup>5</sup>, the founder of the house. Doering pictures Goethe as on his way to Leipzig<sup>6</sup> and Rothschild<sup>7</sup> as about to enter a banking house in Hanover.

After listening to the legend of the Harz *Wunderblume* vividly recounted by mine host, Goethe suggested to his companion that as it was Easter and there were just two of them, they should go forth to seek it. Each plucked his flower. Rothschild hastened to the Falkenstein hard by the Tidienshohle<sup>8</sup> and there discovered treasure. Goethe, lured by love rather than by gold, journeyed to the Ilsenstein<sup>9</sup> where he was welcomed by Ilse and rewarded with the power of song. The poem ends with a brief comparison of the two men.

The full tale of a magical flower found by a pious cowherd near the Tidienshohle is given in C. F. Gottschalck's<sup>10</sup> work on German castles, to the supplement of which Doering contributed<sup>11</sup>. In Gottschalck's version the cowherd's avaricious master, Graf Hermann, who does not realise the significance of the *Wunderblume*, causes his servant to be blinded in order to enjoy the gold himself. The cowherd's dying curse consequently falls upon the count: 'Nebel umdusterten seinen Geist, bis er verstandlos zum Thier herabsank und so, nach wenigen Jahren, starb.'

<sup>1</sup> Cp. K. Goedeke, *Grundriss*, 2nd ed., ix, p. 330.

<sup>2</sup> On Heinrich Doering (1789-1862), poet, biographer and translator, cp. *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxiii, p. 61 n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> The undated MS 5 pp. 4to, signed Heinrich Doering, consists of 137 lines. It was acquired by the writer in November, 1929.

<sup>4</sup> For Goethe's references to Doering's works cp. J. Zeitler, *Goethe-Handbuch*, Stuttgart, 1916, i, p. 420. Among Doering's writings on Goethe are two poems, cp. Goedeke, *Grundriss*, iv, ii, pp. 182, 186.

<sup>5</sup> For an account of Mayer Anselm Rothschild (1743-1812) cp. Doering's short work, *Des Handelshauses Rothschild. Ursprung, Wachsthum und Schicksale*, Leipzig, 1851, and *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, art. Rothschild, xxix, pp. 373-5.

<sup>6</sup> Goethe arrived in Leipzig shortly before October 12, 1765, the date of his first letter to his sister, cp. *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, vii, pp. 5 and 125. He did not visit the Harz at this date. cp. *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Book vi, for an account of his journey from Frankfurt to Leipzig.

<sup>7</sup> Cp. Doering, *op. cit.*, p. 4. 'Mehrere Jahre war er in dem Comptoir eines reichen Bankiers in Hannover.' The banker's name was Oppenheim, cp. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, art. Rothschild.

<sup>8</sup> Cp. A. Gillwald, *Die Sagen vom Ober- und Unterharz, Thale a. Harz*, n.d., pp. 95-6 and p. 68 n. 1.

<sup>9</sup> Cp. *Faust*, i, 3968-9 and p. 68 n. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Caspar Friedrich Gottschalck, *Die Ritterburgen und Bergschlösser Deutschlands*, Halle, 1815-25, ii, pp. 248-55.

<sup>11</sup> Cp. Gottschalck's *Ruinen*, Vienna, 1834, i. Doering also contributed to F. v. Sydow's *Thüringen und der Harz, Volkssagen und Legenden*, Sonderhausen, 1839-44. It is possible that Doering's poem was written too late for inclusion in this 'historisch-romantische Beschreibung' of Thuringia and the Harz.



*Die Wunderblume*<sup>1</sup>.

Ein Blümlein, lieblich duftend, blüht  
 Unfern von Questenberg<sup>2</sup> im Harzgebiet,  
 Schneeweiss, der reinen Unschuld Bild,  
 Mit gold'nen Faden ist der Kelch gefüllt.  
 Bescheiden birgt sich's in des Thales Grunden,  
 Und es entfaltet seine Bluthenpracht  
 Nur einmal<sup>3</sup> jährlich in der Osternacht,  
 Und auch nur dann ist es zu finden.  
 Auch lasst die Wunderblume sich nur sehn,  
 Wenn zwei vereinigt sie zu suchen gehn. 10  
 Wer sie auf seinem Pfad entdeckt und bricht,  
 Behalte sie und wage nicht  
 Sie wieder aus der Hand zu legen,  
 Weil sie sonst ihre Zauberkraft verliert  
 Bewahrt er treulich sie, wie sich's gebührt,  
 Und kömmt mit ihr bis zu den Waldgehegen  
 So öffnet sich, auf sein Geheiss,  
 Der unterird'sche Zauberkreis  
 In des Gebirges dunkeln Schachten;  
 Er darf hinuntersteigen in die Nacht, 20  
 Die aufgehauchten Schätze zu betrachten,  
 Von Gnomen und von Zwergen dort bewacht.  
 Mitnehmen darf er, was es sei,  
 Der Raub gehört zu seinem Eigenthume;  
 Durch den Besitz der Wunderblume  
 Ist dies erlaubt und steht ihm frei<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> On *Wunderblumen* which bring their finder honour and riches cp O. Bockel, *Die Deutsche Volkssage*, Leipzig, 1909, p. 94, cp also Heine's *Harzreise*.

Blumen, kuhne Wunderblumen,  
 Blatter, breit und fabelhaft,  
 Duftig bunt und hastig regsam,  
 Wie gedrängt von Leidenschaft.

H. Heine's *Sämliche Werke*, Leipzig, n d., II, p. 34. For the flower itself cp. *Mod. Lang Rev.*, IX, p. 380.

<sup>2</sup> On 'Questenberg am Harze in der Grafschaft Stolberg' cp Gottschalck, *Die Ritterburgen und Bergschlösser Deutschlands*, ed cit, II, pp 37-56, and *Taschenbuch*, 5th ed., Magdeburg, 1843, p. 210. Cp also *Thüringen und der Harz*, ed cit, VI, p. 68. Questenberg is sometimes spelt Quastenberga, cp L. Hoffmann, *Taschenbuch für Reisende in den Harz*, Berlin, 1829, p. 113

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Gottschalck, *Die Ritterburgen und Bergschlösser Deutschlands*, ed cit, II, pp. 248-9. According to Gottschalck the flower blooms 'jährlich nur ein Mal, am Tage des heiligen Johannis, Mittags um zwölf Uhr' Instead of Midsummer Day Doering has 'Osternacht.' This change is contrary to tradition, cp. O. Bockel, *op. cit.*, p. 94 and note.

<sup>4</sup> P. I of the MS. ends,

Und es geschah, kurz vor der Osternacht,  
 Wo sie sich zeigt in ihrer Bluthenpracht,  
 Dass in die Gegend zwei Gesellen kamen,  
 Die sich von *Frankfurt* auf den Weg gemacht. 30  
*Anselm* und *Wolfgang* waren ihre Namen.  
 In einer Schenke hielten beide Rast,  
 Und von den Schultern warf der alt're Gast,  
*Anselm*, ein schweres Bündel nieder,  
 Das ihm beinah den Rücken wund gedrückt.  
 Hinfällig aber schienen seine Glieder,  
 Und seine Haltung blieb gebuckt.  
 Er war fast duster anzuschauen,  
 Matt hob er das gesenkte Haupt empor,  
 Und unter fast geschloss'nen Brauen 40  
 Sah klug berechnend dann sein Aug' hervor.

Der andere Gesell schien minder alt<sup>1</sup>,  
 Rothwangig, blond, von zierlicher Gestalt,  
 Und Anmuth in den edlen Zügen.  
 Dem Hohern zugewendet war sein Sinn.  
 Nach *Leipzig* wollte *Wolfgang* hin,  
 Um da den Wissenschaften obzuliegen.  
*Anselm* gieng zu ganz andern Zwecken aus.  
 Es trieb ein inn'rer Drang, nicht zu besiegen,  
 Ihn nach *Hannover* in ein Wechselhaus<sup>2</sup>. 50

Und in der Schenke, wo sie eingekehrt,  
 Gab, vielgesprächig, an dem Heerd  
 Der Wirth, ein alter Mann, den Gasten  
 Die Sage von der Blum' am Harz zum Besten.  
 'Die Osternacht,' sprach *Wolfgang*, 'bricht herein,  
 Es trifft sich gut, wir sind gerade' zu zwei'n<sup>3</sup>.  
 Wie, wenn wir giengen und die Blume fanden?'  
 'Das war' ein Fund! Der Erde Schätze ständen  
 Alsdann uns zu Gebot!' fiel *Anselm* ein.

Indem er so dem Vorschlag Beifall zollte, 60  
 Zog er mit *Wolfgang* an des Berges Rand,  
 Und jeder, die gepflückte Blume in der Hand,  
 Beschloss nun, wie er sie gebrauchen wollte.

<sup>1</sup> Goethe was six years younger than Rothschild, cp. p. 65 n. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. p. 65 n. 7.

<sup>3</sup> P. 2 of the MS. ends.

*Anselm* besann darüber sich nicht lang'.  
 Die Lust an Schätzen, die er in sich spürte,  
 Trieb ihn zum *Falkenstein*<sup>1</sup>, von wo ein Gang,  
 Verschuttet halb, zur *Tidiansshohle* fuhrte.  
 In jenem unterird'schen Schacht  
 Lag Gold und Silber aufgehäuft in Fülle,  
 Von Gnomen, wie es hiess, bewacht.  
 Sich zu bereichern dort, war *Anselm's* Wille.

70

Vor schnoder Habsucht stets erfüllt mit Grauen,  
 Zog *Wolfgang* nach dem *Isenstein*,  
 Und diesen Pfad schlug er nur deshalb ein,  
 Die holde Jungfrau *Ilse* dort zu schauen.  
 Sie, die als wunderschön die Sage pries<sup>2</sup>,  
 Gieng dann und wann, im nahen Strom zu baden,  
 Und wer sich dann dort blicken liess,  
 Und scheu zuruckwich<sup>3</sup>, wurde, wie es hiess,  
 Gar freundlich von ihr eingeladen.  
 Sie gönnte dem Bescheid'nen, als Belohnung,  
 Den Eintritt dann in ihre Felsenwohnung.

80

Dort pochte *Wolfgang* an; doch durch die Pforte  
 Erklangen diese rauhen Worte:  
 'Was willst du, Menschenkind? Gold und Gnaden?  
 Dann geh' zur *Tidiansshohle* hin<sup>4</sup>.  
 Dort ist genug für dich und deines Gleichen,  
 Und deinen Zweck wirst du erreichen.  
 Ihr Sterblichen seid thöricht und verkehrt!  
 Doch—da du einmal hier vor meiner Thüre,  
 So nenne, was dein Herz begehrt,  
 Die Perlen, die Smaragden, die Saphire,

90

<sup>1</sup> On Falkenstein and Tidiansshohle cp. Gottschalok, *Taschenbuch*, ed. cit., pp. 174–5, and L. Hoffmann, *Taschenbuch*, ed. cit., pp. 44–50 and 157–8. Tidiansshohle is sometimes spelt Tidiansshohle, cp. Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. C. F. Gottschalok, *Taschenbuch für Reisende in den Harz*, 5th ed., Magdeburg, 1843, p. 159: 'Am Isenstein haftet die Sage, dass ein verwunschenes Schloss auf ihm gestanden, in welchem die reiche, schöne Prinzessin Ilse gewohnt, die sich noch jetzt jeden Morgen vor Aufgang der Sonne in der Ilse bade. Wer so glücklich sei, durch ein Zauberwort zu ihr zu werden, werde von ihr in ihr Schloss im Felsen geführt und königlich bewirthet.' Cp. also Hoffmann, ed. cit., II, 55, for the above passage quoted in the *Harz* from the 1812 edition of Gottschalok's *Taschenbuch* (Magdeburg, 1823). Cp. also *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, 1927–, art. *Ilse*.

<sup>3</sup> This addition is to be found in L. Hoffmann, *Hercynia, Taschenbuch für Reisende in den Harz*, Berlin, 1829, p. 82: 'Wer das Glück hat, sie im Bade zu überraschen, den führt sie, wenn er sonst ein sitzender Palast hat, in ihr steinernes Gemach.' This *Taschenbuch* was so popular that a fourth edition was printed in 1833 at Quedlinburg.

<sup>4</sup> P. 3 of the MS. ends.

Die du verlangst, bestimme Preis und Werth.'

'Dein Anblick,' sagte *Wolfgang*, 'ist der Preis!  
Verkenne nicht mein Trachten und mein Streben.  
*Dich* mocht' ich schau'n, in *deinem* Zauberkreis  
Nur einen Augenblick mit dir verleben.'

Und *Ilse* sprach zu sich in froher Hast,  
'Das ist der erste Mensch, der Gold verachtet,  
Und nicht nach meinen Schätzen trachtet' 100  
Sei,' fuhr sie fort, 'hier diese Nacht mein Gast'  
Er stand, als sie ihn mit sich nahm in's Schloss,  
Geblendet von dem Glanz, der ihn umfloss.  
Und als er ihr die Wunderblume reichte,  
Geschah's, dass *Ilse* hold sich zu ihm neigte,  
Und ihn mit ihren Armen fest umschlang,  
Indess ein sanft verhallender Gesang  
Im Laubgefluster und Gerausch der Wogen,  
Die an dem *Ilsestein* vorüberzogen,  
In süssen Tönen wundersam erklang. 110

Der Jüngling traf nach süsser Rast,  
Im Walde seinen fruheren Begleiter<sup>1</sup>.  
Er keuchte unter einer schweren Last,  
Doch schien er ungewöhnlich heiter.  
'Wer hatte,' rief er, 'das gedacht?  
Das nenn' ich einen Fund gemacht!  
Reich bin ich, unermesslich reich—  
Doch sagt mir, wie ergieng es euch?'—

'Wie's mir ergieng? In hundert Liedern,'  
Sprach *Wolfgang*, 'werd' ich auch darauf erwiedern. 120  
In meinem Kopfe gluhet und braust  
Die alte Wundermahr vom *Faust*,  
Die mir *Schön-Ilse* eingehaucht; mich locken  
Die Hexenfrauen nach dem *Brocken*.'

'Wie? Märchen? Lieder?' sagte *Anselm* trocken:  
'Wer darum Perl' und Edelstein verschmäh't  
Und wohlgeränderte Dukaten,  
Ei, dem ist nicht zu helfen, noch zu rathen,  
Und es gereut ihn einst noch, doch zu spät.'

So trennte, bei dem ersten Morgenschimmer, 130  
Sich der Gefährten Pfad für immer.

<sup>1</sup> P. 4 of the MS. ends.

Den Einen, *Anselm Rothschild*, liess auf Erden  
 Das Schicksal einen zweiten Krosus werden,  
 Den man nur seines Reichthums wegen pries;  
 Doch von der späten Nachwelt stets bewundert  
 Als Dichterheros, nennt noch manch Jahrhundert  
 Den Zweiten, welcher *Wolfgang Goethe* hiess.

*Henrich Doering.*

H. GORDON WARD.

LIVERPOOL.

## PROPOSED TRIBUTE TO PROFESSOR EDMUND GARDNER

The Committee of the Modern Humanities Research Association and the Editors of the *Modern Language Review* cordially endorse the following proposal made in a circular issued by the Committee of the Edmund G. Gardner Fund, under the patronage of His Excellency Sir Eric Drummond, H.B.M.'s Ambassador to the Court of Italy, and His Excellency Signor Dino Grandi, Ambassador of H.M. the King of Italy to the Court of St James.

To mark the occasion of his retirement from the Chair of Italian in the University of London it is considered that a fund might be collected, of which one of the principal objects should be the preparation and publication of a bibliography of Professor Gardner's writings. It is hoped that a copy of the bibliography might be distributed to all subscribers to the fund.

The committee which has been formed, representing Italian and other interests, trusts that the fund will be contributed to by as many friends and pupils of Professor Gardner as possible, in order that it may be fully representative, and in that hope will be happy to receive small as well as larger donations.

Contributions or promises of contributions may be sent either to Professor C. J. Sisson, Hon. Treasurer, or to Miss E. H. Bigg Wither, Hon. Secretary, Edmund G. Gardner Fund, University College, London, W.C. 1.

## REVIEWS

*The Consecutive Subjunctive in Old English.* By MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR.  
(*Modern Language Association of America*, Monograph Series, 4)  
Boston: D. C. Heath, London: Oxford University Press. 1933.  
viii + 110 pp. \$1.50.

This excellently produced monograph contains a further instalment of Professor Callaway's researches into the use of the subjunctive in Old English, and this time he deals, on the same general lines as in his previous work, with adverb clauses in which the consecutive subjunctive is preceded by particles such as *swā*, *þæt*, etc. The particles introducing the clauses are carefully separated into correlative and single, the former being again subdivided into non-prepositional and prepositional, and the value of this procedure is seen in the results obtained. Attention is directed to cases where the form is ambiguous, the tenses are distinguished; and though the subjunctive proper and the subjunctive formed by means of auxiliaries are grouped together in the text, the two types are entered apart at the end of the book. Cases of possible Latin influence in translated works are noticed, and the prose and poetical texts are kept asunder. In short, from a purely descriptive point of view there are no loopholes.

Venturing into deeper water, Professor Callaway next turns his attention to the origin of the consecutive subjunctive and by an ingenious method seeks to controvert the opinions of those who hold that its use is due to the nature of the main clause. Indeed so strongly does he oppose this doctrine, that he tends to repeat himself and is beguiled into writing a short chapter—the one really weak spot in the whole book—consisting of such quotations as he can find about the use of the consecutive subjunctive in the older periods of the other Germanic languages, in order to demonstrate how far these support him, or the reverse.

Finally the results are displayed statistically in a series of elaborate tables, from which many important and detailed conclusions emerge. Suffice it that he makes a strong claim to be in a position, both to estimate the relative frequency of the indicative and subjunctive in Old English consecutive clauses, and to distinguish cases where the use of the latter is due to Latin influence from those where its use is of native origin.

Since Professor Callaway is thorough in his methods, cautious in making any generalisations about the meaning of the subjunctive, honest in quoting opposing views (even to the extent of noticing popular translations), and diffident both about his own figures and the difficulty of distinguishing between final and consecutive clauses—any criticisms on these matters is disarmed. It may, however, be permissible to call his attention to the examples given on pp. 21, 22, and 23, some of which seem to be rather typical of relative clauses. Of those given on the following pages is it not a fact that virtually every one has a negative in the main clause? But this last remark is provocative, and it is more fitting to

congratulate Professor Callaway on a solid piece of work for which students of Old English syntax have every reason to be grateful

A. O. BELFOUR.

BELFAST

*The Seven Sages of Rome (Southern Version)*. Edited from the MSS by KARL BRUNNER. Early English Text Society, Original Series, No. 191. 1933 (for 1932). xxxiv + 233 pp 24s.

This is a reprint of the text of the *Seven Sages* in the Auchinleck MS. in the National Library of Scotland, with variants from other MSS. The Auchinleck MS. text lacks lines 1-119 and the last eleven hundred lines of the poem, but, undeterred by this mutilation, Professor Brunner offers other texts to make up the omissions. The choice of a mutilated text was dictated by necessity. It is the oldest.

This volume must be considered in connexion with other studies and texts of the *Seven Sages*, the literature concerning which is now growing considerable. The English version, which is in octosyllabic couplets, has an immediate ancestor in a French prose version which exists in many MSS., enumerated by Gaston Paris in 1876, when publishing two French texts of the story. Professor Brunner raises the question whether the Middle English couplet version could have come direct from a French prose MS., but answers it at once in a reply which is startling. 'English secular prose was almost unknown when the *S.S.* was translated and verse continued to be used for narrative even much later.' Little secular prose may have come down, but there is no need to assume that it was therefore 'almost unknown,' so rare, in fact, that a translator who presumably did not write his private letters in verse, was compelled to use metre in translating prose. Considerations of the greater popularity of verse, of convention, or the artistic decision to write in verse, may all have influenced him, but not the state of secular prose.

The present edition is wholly textual and philological. There is no mention of the literary origins of the poem, or of its influence. As this was once a widely-read story in England and in Scotland, I regret these omissions, and think some literary discussion would have been of much greater value than the reams of variant readings for the Auchinleck MS. part of the text. Except on one page these never cover less than one-third of the printed page, and often cover over half, and are printed in continuous lines of small italics, where the least the printers could have done was to print the line numbers in heavier type. I ought to congratulate the editor on his industry and patience in preparing these lists of variants, but I feel that, since most appear to be derived from the version in Balliol College MS. 354, it would have been better to reproduce this text in full, in columns parallel with that of the Auchinleck MS. text, leaving readings from the other MSS. for the bottom of the page. As the parallel-text method has been employed for the beginning and the last eleven hundred lines of the poem, the portions not covered by the Auchinleck MS., it would have been better to have employed it throughout the whole work.

May I take this opportunity of suggesting two innovations. (1) the listing, on the back of the title-page, of early printed editions of works edited from MSS., (2) where works by the same author, or translator, have been already printed by the Society, a list, with series, number, and year of publication, should be given.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

SHEFFIELD.

Surrey's *Fourth Booke of Virgill*. Edited, with Introduction, Variant Readings and Notes, by HERBERT HARTMAN. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1933 xxviii+54 pp. and facsimile. 18s.

In this important reprint Mr Hartman provides double measure by following up his text of Day's undated edition of Surrey's translation of *Aeneid* iv with a facsimile of the unique quarto which has long been inaccessible to scholars. In a closely packed Introduction he discusses the problem of its date and of the inter-relation of the three surviving texts (Day's, Tottel's and the Hargrave MS), disposes of the alleged dependence of Surrey's version upon Italian predecessors and Gavin Douglas, and winds up with an appreciation of the poetic and prosodic interest of this pioneer piece. Surrey's blank verse experiment bristles with thorny problems, literary, bibliographical, textual and prosodic. The date of Day's edition is exasperatingly difficult to establish, but even if (as seems most unlikely) Day's text appeared after Tottel's *Certain Bokes* (1557), its claim to represent the most authentic version of the first blank verse experiment in English remains unimpaired. Owen's chief authority was a copy of Surrey's autograph eked out by two other MSS, and his text, in spite of its numerous blunders, preserves more faithfully than either Tottel or Hargrave Surrey's early Tudor style and prosody. Mr Hartman's enterprise should therefore do much to place our study of early Tudor language and metre on a sounder basis; the use of Tottel's text of either the *Songs and Sonnets* or the *Certain Bokes* can only mislead us.

There are three major points of literary importance on which I feel that I must reluctantly join issue with Mr Hartman.

(1) On p. xv he speaks of the attested popularity of Surrey's translation and pictures a wide circulation in manuscript. He has earlier collected the known references to Surrey's experiment. They do not constitute evidence of popularity. Tottel's *Certain Bokes* would seem to have fallen still-born from the press, what references there are to Surrey's translation are far from numerous and for the most part vague. Puttenham looked upon the *Songs and Sonnets* as a literary landmark and drew illustrations repeatedly from it; he never mentions the *Certain Bokes* or shows himself aware of the existence of the new verse form. Indeed, links of continuity between Day's 'straunge metre' and the 'unbid iambs' of the popular stage are not as easy to trace as a convinced admirer of Surrey's talent and originality would wish.



(2) I cannot share the insular view of Surrey's culture and aims. Mr Hartman will concede no influence from foreign models and sees Surrey's experiment as 'the product of strictly English humanism'. I do not understand this phrase. Humanism was a European phenomenon; its essence was the contact of culture with culture and it could never have arisen in England without the orientation of men's minds towards the fountain-head in Italy. A strict nationalism does not belong to a courtly maker under Henry VIII and to a friend and disciple of Wyatt. There is no need to imagine Surrey sitting down to work surrounded by copies of his Italian predecessors and laboriously arriving at his English *via* the Italian, but he must have known what the Italians were doing and that *versi sciolti* were among the latest and most interesting of their humanistic toys.

(3) Still less can I accept Mr Hartman's dismissal of the mass of evidence proving Surrey's knowledge of Gavin Douglas's rendering of the *Aeneid*. There is far more resemblance between the diction of the two translators than is explained by a common origin and Mr Hartman's theory of joint recourse to the same commentator (Servius). If we make large deductions for numberless identical words linked etymologically with the Latin (*flame* for *flamma*, *fyate* for *fixum*, etc.) and others which represent the obvious translation of the Latin original (*breast* for *pectore*), there still remains a host of correspondences that cannot be lightly brushed aside. It cannot be coincidence that in any passage chosen at random a large number of the key-words will correspond in the *Scots* and *English* while there is no such detailed parallelism in the two *English* translations of Surrey and Phaer. Still less is it a coincidence that these words frequently cohere in the same phrases; sometimes of seven or eight words to a line five or more will correspond in the two texts and will be arranged in much the same fashion:

Virgil:	Iunoni	cur vincla iugaha curae (59)
Douglas:	Quhilk	heth in cur the band of marriage.
Surrey:	Whych	hath in care the bande of maryage
Phaer:	Iuno	chief that hath of wedlocks cure.

It is beyond the bounds of probability that Surrey with the respect for his original he generally displays and with his natural sense of the austere and heroic in diction would have independently lapsed into identical inadequate translations and twistings of the sense. Two of many examples which could be quoted make it clear that at times the shadow of Douglas fell between Surrey and Virgil:

Virgil:	<i>avi similis, quae circum litora, circum</i> <i>pisces scopulos, humilis volat aequora iuxta</i> (254-5).
Douglas:	<i>Lyke till a foull that, endlang the cost syde,</i> <i>About the strandis of fishe plentius and wyde,</i> <i>Fleis by the watir, scummand the fludis law.</i>
Surrey:	<i>Like to the foule, that endlong costes and strondes</i> <i>Swarming with fyshe, flyes sweping by the sea.</i>
Virgil:	<i>totamque incensa per urbem</i> <i>bacchatur</i> (300-1).

Douglas *Scho wskis wild throw the town of Cartage;*  
*Sic vise, as quhen thir nuns of Bacchus. . .*  
 Surrey *And whysketh through the towne like Bacchus nunne.*

The use of the word *whysketh* (of northern origin and as yet in the early sixteenth century an alien in English speech) proves, in so far as a single word can, that Surrey must have had access to the work of the Scots translator

The exigencies of space seem to have imposed on Mr Hartman a condensation which sometimes renders his Introduction obscure, and several of the problems he deals with demand more searching investigation than his limits allow. In spite of this, students of early Tudor style and prosody are deeply indebted to him for his excellent text and the strenuous accompanying textual and prosodic notes.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY.

*A Companion to Shakespeare Studies.* Edited by HARLEY GRANVILLE-BARKER and G. B. HARRISON. Cambridge University Press. 1934. x+408 pp. 10s. 6d.

This admirable compendium reflects several trends of recent scholarship in general. To profess one century, still more to profess a single writer, invites indictment for over-specialisation. Yet these fourteen essays by as many contributors enforce the dismal truth that henceforth no one man may hope to become master of the whole Shakespeare field. For even that limited area is further subdivided: there is a life's work in palæography and its applications, in the vicissitudes of the poet's reputation, in the social background and the dramatist's response to it. The study of Shakespeare is no longer an arena on whose crimsoned sands every editor knifes his predecessor, nor a circus where jealous troupes of aerial individualists astonish the yokels by defying the laws of gravity and common sense: it is at last a great co-operative undertaking, and this book is itself an expressionistic symbol. In the great collaboration, of which the present volume is but one example, the world of scholarship is exhibited far in advance of the world of political organisation, to which the selfless and unregimented labours of the researchers, scattered from Silesia to Sydney, but united in a spiritual bond, are a standing reproach and ought to be an ideal and hope. For this reason an American student must regret the editors' austere desire 'to weld the book into something like a whole' and its triumph over their natural inclination to look for some of their collaborators in the imperial commonwealths and regions thereunto adjacent. The book is far from welded, but with some conspicuous exceptions hangs together remarkably well; it constitutes an impressive tribute to the quality of contemporary scholarship on the island of Great Britain.

Yet the professor of one-fourteenth<sup>1</sup> of the Shakespeare field is luckier

<sup>1</sup> Mr J. Isaacs, who writes the section on 'Shakespearean Scholarship,' lists *twenty-six* subdivisions of the field, stopping, one suspects, only because the alphabet ran out.

than many of his colleagues even in other humanistic territories. The sheer greatness of the subject, his divinity one might say (though that is not the tone of our *Companion*), has a saving grace. The doctrine of the microcosm seems to hold good in Shakespeare studies; it is impossible for the humblest explorer, beset with the trees of the remotest grove, ever to forget the majesty of the forest. The magnitude, moreover, of the corpus, the enormous circle that was swept by Shakespeare's eye, leads the student to almost everything under the sun. To acquire the sum total of what the Shakespeare scholar would like to grasp as expertly as Mr Polard ('Shakespeare's Text') plays the bibliographical game or as Professor Sisson ('The Theatres and Companies') penetrates the Globe and the Blackfriars, would come near to making a man the master of those who know.

The space allotted in this book to backgrounds, conditions, and methods is also indicative of the redistribution of emphasis which the last quarter of a century has seen. So is Professor Mackail's reduction of the biography to eight sober pages<sup>1</sup>. So is the editors' decision to leave the personal problem of the sonnets to the lunatic fringe. So is Mr Granville-Barker's exposition of the way 'Shakespeare's Dramatic Art' developed inside the theatre. This is the longest of the essays and one of the most brilliant. How the artist went upon the stage, mastered its conventions, perceived its possibilities and limitations, and subdued himself to the medium without shortening his poetic stature, we are told in ten cogent little essays under such subtitles as 'The Convention of Time,' 'Character Dominant,' and 'Fireside Versus Theatre.' Of these 'The Soliloquy' is briefest and least comprehensive. For, besides its use as 'the direct means to self-revelation' and for a lazy kind of exposition, the Elizabethan soliloquy is sometimes an insignificant time-filler and sometimes a spouting bit for the actor—a mere piece of rhetorical coloratura. We still have with us those who dissect Shakespeare's plays as if Racine had written them, discovering all sorts of Frenchified inner harmonies behind the mixture of Gothic and Renaissance in the façade. Mr Granville-Barker's thirty-eight pages may be commended to all who, for example, look upon *Richard the Third* as a well-balanced neo-classical tragedy.

Mr George Rylands follows with a somewhat fanciful discourse on 'Shakespeare the Poet'. He says much that is stimulating and offers a large number of attractive generalisations about method and indebtedness and progress, as well as suggestive comparisons between Shakespeare's imagery and the practice of others. But I can make nothing of

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps an over-reduction, though if one is to err it had better be in that direction. The essay style is responsible for several locutions like 'various bequests to three of his colleagues in the King's Company' and 'the story of Shakespeare and Burbage recorded by Manningham.' Where there is so little fact it might better have all been stated. On the other hand, there is no real evidence in Downes's *Roscius Anglicanus* that Shakespeare was 'more a driller of actors than . . . an actor himself.' As the author he would outline his conception of his characters to the various members of the company. Taylor, however, as Professor T. W. Baldwin has observed, did not come in till after Shakespeare's death; Downes is no authority for the pre-Wars theatres, though the tradition he records may in this instance have something in it, and in any case Taylor doubtless saw Burbage play Hamlet.

his argument that 'the first soliloquy of Hamlet is...the first piece of essentially dramatic verse in Shakespeare', and though his theories rest upon the dualism recently denounced by Mr Eliot, a careful re-reading of the essay fails to convince one reader (perhaps this is only confessing a reviewer's subjection to the tyranny of this same specialisation) that its author is completely proficient in the distinctions between verse and poetry and between the nature of the poetry which is always to be found in great imaginative drama, whether in verse or prose, whether romantic, naturalistic, or expressionistic, and the nature of lyric poetry.

Miss G. D. Willcock's contribution is not a beginner's guide to Elizabethan English but an ingenious speculation on the extent to which Shakespeare's art was rooted in its peculiar qualities. Professor Edward J. Dent, Dr G. B. Harrison, Miss M. St Clare Byrne, and Mr Harold Child write with authority and charm on 'Shakespeare and Music,' 'The National Background,' 'The Social Background,' and 'Shakespeare in the Theatre from the Restoration to the Present Time.' To Mr A. L. Attwater was assigned the difficult task of describing 'Shakespeare's Sources,' outlining the pressure on playwrighting of theatrical needs, indicating the scope of the poet's reading, and exposing the large claims of the dis-integrators. No one could give these subjects adequate treatment in twenty-two pages, but Mr Attwater displays a pretty talent for summary and his opinions are cautious and eminently sane.

Mr Bonamy Dobrée likewise essays an almost hopeless task, though in 'Shakespeare and the Drama of his Time' (nineteen pages) he acquits himself with his customary brilliance. He gives too much, I think, to Peele; there is no more reason for crediting that very minor dramatist with letting 'a rush of fresh air into English comedy' than for granting the honour to the author of *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. He is a little inconsistent in his remarks on Lyly, incautiously asserting (p. 245) that 'we can safely reject him as an early influence on Shakespeare', cf. (p. 259) 'in his early years [Shakespeare] was apprenticed . . . to Marlowe, Kyd, Lyly, Greene, and perhaps others.' The treatment of Kyd is inadequate: Shakespeare may have learned from him how to build up an effective scene by the use of concrete detail; at any rate the lesson was there in *The Spanish Tragedy*. If there is a weakness in the essay as a whole, it is a tendency to minimise technique in favour of style and content. Mr Dobrée has some shrewd things to say about dramatic trends as Shakespeare approached his retirement; he is very severe with Beaumont and Fletcher, but is he too severe?

The result was the prettification of the drama; even tragedy...was prettified; the sentiments are 'literary' in the bad sense of the word, 'poetic' in the same bad sense, 'poetry' being added as a 'beauty,' instead of being the life-blood of the whole thing.

Would it be possible to arrange a mock trial of Beaumont and Fletcher on the charge of seducing the Elizabethans' tragic Muse, with Messrs Dobrée, Eliot, and Rylands among counsel? In conclusion Mr Dobrée neatly puts Archer in his place, and no less neatly justifies the importance which some of us attach to the study of the post-Elizabethans, 'especially

perhaps Massinger, to see the emotional units, which apparently were real to the Elizabethans, becoming counters.'

Mr Pollard summarises the 'bad quarto' theories, which are so largely based on his own monumental contribution in 1909. He is too modest when he writes that they have 'obtained considerable acceptance in England, though not much as yet among foreign students.' A large section of his essay is devoted to rehearsing the controversy over the 'D' hand in *Sir Thomas More*, and the implications of the possibility that we have three pages in Shakespeare's autograph. Mr Pollard is non-committal on Professor Wilson's *New Shakespeare*, which he aptly describes as 'easily the most exciting ever printed'

Shakespeare criticism down through Coleridge is handled by Mr T. S. Eliot. His remark that had he flourished under the Stuarts he might have preferred Beaumont and Fletcher to Shakespeare can hardly have been intended as more than an easy way of stirring up the animals, yet one's first impulse on seeing his name among the collaborators is to ask what Mr Eliot is doing in this galley. Well, he is doing about what one would expect. He begins by denying that historical scholarship and reason will take us all the way to the truth about Shakespeare; the mystical experience is essential to criticism, and one mystical experience is about as good as another. Mr Eliot does not, of course, purvey his metaphysical idealism quite so bluntly, but that is what it comes to. The history of criticism interests him, to be sure; but the notion that the contemporary scholar's operations represent progress toward an ultimate goal he flatly rejects. There are kind words for Jonson, Dryden, and the great Doctor, but Mr Eliot's way leads—not of course to madness; there are wise sayings in this essay—but to Coleridge, a queer goal for the professional neo-classicist! Him Mr Eliot would 'isolate as perhaps the greatest single figure in Shakespeare criticism down to the present day.'

The story is taken up by Mr J. Isaacs, who writes less abstractly but keeps the galley stroke. With side glances at 'Furnivall's platonic affairs with Shakespeare's heroines,' and at Mr Bradley's 'magnificent, influential, and dangerously side-tracking studies, written, as it were, in the margin of Hegel,' Mr Isaacs sets up, as Mr Eliot does not, some objects of Shakespeare criticism:

(a) to give a picture of the author by tracing his treatment of material so far as it is conscious, or eliciting his unconscious processes without imposing an autobiography of the critic upon the victim of his inquiries, (b) to give the pattern of the man and dissect for admiration the beauties he produces, the complexity and explosive force of the poetry, and the deploying and juxtaposition of the characters.

'The new realism has tried to isolate and display, not the Romantic Shakespeare, nor the Victorian Shakespeare, but the Elizabethan Shakespeare. The present tendency of Shakespeare criticism is to face the author squarely rather than dodge him by excursions into philosophy, history, or ethics.' It is good to see at least a passing reference to the valuable iconoclasm of Mr George Bernard Shaw (valuable, that is, in its time and in clearing the way for the second great renaissance of British

drama)—Mr Augustus Ralli's 'history' of Shakespeare criticism does not mention Mr Shaw<sup>1</sup>

It is scarcely less strange that Professor George Lyman Kittredge's *Shakspeare* figures neither there nor in the *Companion*. Long before the historical realism of Professors Stoll and Schucking, and quite unconstricted by their somewhat doctrinaire tendency, Mr Kittredge was exemplifying a thoroughly realistic, yet perfectly balanced, highly sensitive, and by no means prosaic approach to the problems of Shakespearean character and of Elizabethan technique in general. His teaching has been disseminated chiefly by a host of pupils; yet the most pregnant short discourse ever delivered on this subject is probably the *Shakspeare*, a work which everyone who essays Elizabethan criticism ought to read at least once a year. Its occasion was the tercentenary celebration at Harvard in 1916; but, fortified as it is by Professor Kittredge's unrivalled command of Elizabethan English, it embodies conclusions reached many years earlier, through a unique mastery of textual exegesis and its application to problems of interpretation, before research in theatrical and social backgrounds had confirmed the reaction against the Romantic criticism<sup>1</sup>.

Mr Isaacs also handles 'Shakespearean Scholarship'—naturally, for in the twentieth century the two subjects are inextricable. The mystical experience will continue, we may be confident, to produce beautiful literary effects, and we shall find no better way of entering the mind of a Coleridge or an Eliot than by reading what he writes about what Shakespeare means to him; but the *only* road to *Shakespeare's* mind is going to be built by the kind of scholarship to which the greater part of our *Companion* is dedicated.

And now, what is the book good for as a whole? It is certainly not a handbook for juvenile students, it is not so much a book of facts as of expert opinion on the significance of the facts. The editors planned it as a ground for examining the question, 'What avenues of Shakespeare scholarship now most needed exploration? That led to a consideration of recent work, its sufficiency or prospects, and that to the assembling of the present material.' The Shakespeare sub-specialists will not find much news in the *Companion*. Its usefulness to scholars resides in its character as an extraordinarily judicious piece of collective summing up. Thus far three centuries have taken us, but how much remains to be done! In several of the most important directions we are obviously at the beginning of the road. Among 'college' and secondary-school teachers, as well as among general readers whose appreciation of Shakespeare if uncritical is not incurious, we must hope the book will circulate widely. Relatively few members of these groups, in America at any rate, have the slightest inkling of the recent revolutions; like most of the journalistic critics they are still reading the texts handed down by the editors of the eighteenth century, in the light afforded by the (Bradleian) afterglow

<sup>1</sup> Another omission is the Revised [American] Arden edition, not the equal of its English namesake, but on the whole a more serious performance than either the Tudor or the Yale editions, both of which are mentioned by Mr Isaacs.

from the vanished sun of nineteenth-century Romanticism. The volume before us affords a better light. And there is scarcely a page which could not be read with pleasure by anyone who loves the plays.

HAZELTON SPENCER

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

*The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' and the Problems of its Transmission.* By J. DOVER WILSON [*Shakespeare Problems*, IV.] Cambridge. University Press. 1934. 2 vols. xvii + 435 pp. 15s.

These two volumes, which have grown out of the series of Sandars lectures delivered by Professor Dover Wilson in 1932, constitute the most minute and I think the most important contribution that has yet been made to the textual study of *Hamlet*. This is the more striking in that the problem of the first quarto is, except for incidental mention, excluded from their pages.

I confess that at first blush this was a disappointment to me. But, after all, the present investigation was undertaken as the necessary preliminary to the edition of *Hamlet* which is promised immediately in the New Cambridge Shakespeare, and I was soon convinced by Professor Wilson's persuasive argument that editorially the important question is the textual relation of the two 'good' versions, and that on this the 'bad' quarto of 1603 can throw only incidental light. Most critics are now agreed that, whatever else Q 1 may be, it is a reported text representing, at any rate in the main, a performance at the Globe about 1602; and if this be granted it is all that is needed for a criticism of the other texts, and therefore all that an editor needs to know. Professor Wilson's own conclusion is that for the performance of 1602 the company used the actual prompt book that lies without material alteration behind the folio text of 1623. In that case, if Q 1 is anything more than a memorial perversion of the *textus receptus* (as Professor Wilson appears to think it is) its peculiar features are something introduced into the report from outside and afford no evidence that Shakespeare's play underwent revision after its first appearance on the boards.

But while I acquiesce in the exclusion of the Q 1 problem from the present investigation, and even agree that it has in the past proved a red herring, distracting editors' attention from the more important problems presented by the 'good' texts, I cannot but feel that, as a question of bibliographical as distinct from editorial criticism, it retains all its fascination. In this I think Professor Wilson would agree, and I have not lost hope that he will one day give us his considered interpretation both of that riddle and of the associated *Brudermord* as well.

The present work falls into three sections. The first volume attacks the bibliographical problem of the origin and relation of the two 'good' texts of 1605 (Q 2) and 1623 (F 1); the second (with continuous pagination) investigates the editorial consequences of the conclusions formed, and also includes comprehensive appendices presenting in convenient shape the mass of textual evidence that forms the basis of the investigation.

It will be well to begin with a bald outline of Professor Wilson's theory respecting the texts. According to this Shakespeare handed over his completed autograph of the play to the Lord Chamberlain's men in 1601. From these 'foul papers' the official prompt book was prepared and the play produced. A memorial report of the production furnished at least the basis for Q 1, a piratical venture whose chief importance lies in the fact that its appearance induced the company to publish the genuine text. For this purpose they handed over the 'foul papers,' which had now served their theatrical purpose, to James Roberts, a friendly printer who had already made what was probably a 'blocking' entry of the piece in the Stationers' Register on 26 July 1602. In Roberts's office Q 2 was set up from Shakespeare's autograph by a rather inexperienced and hurried compositor, by no means fitted to grapple with so difficult a task. His proofs were presumably revised, and we know that his sheets were in some instances corrected in the course of printing by a press reader who when he found an unintelligible reading resorted to guesswork rather than to the author's manuscript. Such was the nature of the first edition in which Shakespeare's *Hamlet* appeared before the reading public in recognisable form.

Twenty years after the printing of Q 1 Shakespeare's fellows gave his collected plays to the world in the first folio. While in several cases they were content to reprint earlier quartos with more or less correction and revision, in that of *Hamlet* they for some reason preferred to have recourse to their own prompt book. They did not, however, hand this precious document over to the printer, since it must have been still in constant use, but caused a transcript to be made for the purpose. This formed the copy for F 1.

We see, therefore, that between Shakespeare's autograph and Q 2 there lies a rather incompetent compositor, whose transmission has been complicated by the intrusions of a careless corrector. Thus, although it presents in some ways a superficially unsatisfactory text, it is separated but by a single step from the original, and possesses first-rate importance for an editor. Between the same manuscript and F 1 there lies, first the playhouse scribe who prepared the prompt book, next the scribe who more than twenty years later made the transcript for press, and lastly a compositor of considerably greater ability than the prentice hand of Q 2, besides no doubt a press reader whom we have no reason to suppose any less competent.

We can now pass to a more detailed consideration of the theory and to some incidental criticisms. I will begin with a preliminary point. While I am delighted to see that Professor Wilson speaks of Q 2 as 'the quarto of 1605' rather than 1604, since the date was deliberately altered from the latter to the former while the final sheet of the book was going through the press, I cannot agree that this 'means that Q 2 was certainly not published until 1605.' It seems to have been quite common, then as now, to put the date of the following year on a book printed and published at the beginning of winter. When the printer set up the date 1604 he did so presumably because he was working before 1 January 1605, and when,



perhaps the following day, it was altered to 1605, it may have been not because publication was to be delayed, but merely that the book might longer retain the appearance of freshness. All we can say with confidence is that Q 2 probably appeared either in December 1604 or January 1605—its official date was certainly 1605<sup>1</sup>.

Shakespeare's manuscript was probably not very tidy, whatever the piety of Heminge and Condell may have said on the subject. We have reason to suppose that his hand was not always of the clearest, and that there were occasional unsolved tangles of alteration in his text. And there seems to be reliable evidence that what he handed over was a rough copy, the 'foul papers' as it was called, that is the completed and corrected draft, not a fair copy that could itself serve as prompt book. We know that in some instances prompt copies were prepared by the authors, in others by scribes. There is nothing to lead us to suppose that Shakespeare had any hand in the preparation of the 'book' of *Hamlet*, beyond perhaps indicating where cuts could be made. And if he did that, he did it not on the finished 'book' but on the 'foul papers' themselves, for surely Professor Wilson's third alternative explanation of the loss of the second half of iv, i, 40 (p. 30) is far too satisfying not to be accepted as true.

In passing it must be admitted that these cuts raise a problem of their own, for they amount to no more than 229 lines out of a total of 3929—a mere flea-bite. As it stands in F 1—and even there some of the omissions appear to be accidental—the play is of quite inordinate length, a length which there is serious difficulty in supposing was ever performed on the stage and is certainly out of all proportion to the normal run of Elizabethan plays.

That the printer of Q 2 was unskilful is evident. Apart from a liability, which he shared with all compositors, to misread ill-formed letters, and a tendency, which he shared with many, to guess at a word from its general appearance, his chief fault seems to have been the persistent omission of letters, syllables, words, phrases, and even whole lines, which Professor Wilson attributes to an attempt to work beyond the speed of which he was really capable. However this may be, the failing seems to be combined with a conscientious if unintelligent attempt to follow his author's script as closely as possible. In particular it is reasonable to suppose that his light punctuation reproduces that of the manuscript with some fidelity. Though to our ideas often deficient and at times obviously erroneous, it is on the whole, according to Elizabethan principles, satisfactory enough, and when Professor Wilson insists that it is a thing of beauty, one may smile without seriously dissenting. It is indeed a fortunate chance that has given us a text preserving even approximately what we may suppose to have been Shakespeare's own deliberate pointing—or scoring as Professor

<sup>1</sup> It is a little unfortunate that the three '1605' copies happen to be in England, while the three '1604' copies happen to be in America, since an insistence on the former as the correct date may seem to disparage the American collections. Nothing, of course, can have been further from Professor Wilson's intention, but susceptibilities may not be soothed by an unlucky slip on p. 122 which places the Elizabethan Club Library at New York instead of New Haven (Yale University).

Wilson is inclined to call it—provided always that we can speak of deliberation in this connexion at all.

The activities of the press corrector can be studied in the sixteen textual variants so far observed between different copies of Q 2, no less than nine of which occur in the outer forme of sheet N. While some are corrections of obvious literal errors (in many cases omissions) such as 'brames' for 'braues' and 'responsue' for 'reponsue,' others are pretty obviously bad guesses such as 'thirtie' for 'thereby' (F 1 'shortly'), and 'doo't' for 'too't,' which there seems no reason whatever to alter. Since only six copies of the original are known, and these supply evidence of correction in only six or seven out of twenty-six formes, it is probable that correction was more widespread than we are now aware, and that of the score or so of formes in which no variant has so far been discovered, some at least underwent a similar process, though they have only come down to us in either a corrected or an uncorrected state. But such correction during printing, though instances are common, must nevertheless be regarded as abnormal: the regular correction would of course be done in proof before printing began. And if the same press reader treated the proofs in the same high-handed manner as he did the sheets, it is difficult to set any limit to the havoc he may have wrought by interference with the more naive errors of the compositor. At the same time a word of caution may be desirable. It is by no means certain that the agent would be the same in the two cases, and even if he were, he would in the case of the proofs naturally have the copy by him and might be expected to consult it, while in the case of errors later discovered in the course of printing, the copy would probably not be at hand and the temptation to guess would consequently be greater.

Be this as it may, it is evident that Q 2, while its proximity to the autograph makes it a text of peculiar authority, is at the same time one that needs to be used with peculiar caution.

The unlikelihood of Shakespeare having had anything to do with the preparation of the prompt book is evident from the way in which the folio text freely alters effects which seem designed in the quarto, substituting competent theatrical arrangement for what was perhaps sometimes the subtler dramatic intention of the author, excises or arbitrarily emends tangles in which his fluent pen had involved him; and generally elaborates the stage directions in a form suitable for performance. All this, if it interposes as it were a theatrical curtain between us and the inspiration of the dramatist, is competent enough in its way, and we must suppose that the process was carried through without offending the susceptibilities of the easy-going author. But Professor Wilson, like Sig. Ramello, has had to give up his earlier belief that F 1 was printed directly from the Globe prompt book. The text of 1623 contains a large number of readings, either manifestly wrong or so inferior to those of 1605 as to be open to serious suspicion, which cannot reasonably be ascribed either to the compositor or to the competent scribe of the prompt copy. They can only have originated, so it is contended, in a hasty transcript by one who knew the play almost by heart, knew it as it

was current upon the stage, including actors' perversions, misinterpretations, interpolations, and the like, whose mind was prone to pick up words and phrases from other, but similar, contexts, and weave them unconsciously into the passage he was writing, and who was inclined to ease his task by setting down rather what his memory suggested than the literal text that lay before him in the 'book.' To this agency may be ascribed, for instance, the large number of repetitive phrases that occur in Hamlet's part in F 1. It has been suggested that such repetition was a trick of Burbage's, but this would seem to be but a half-truth. Some of them occur already in Q 2 and were no doubt intended by Shakespeare as an expression of the brooding mind of the prince—'words, words, words.' But it would seem that Burbage seized upon and exaggerated the characteristic, so that we find more than twice as many instances in F 1 as in Q 2.

It is, perhaps, a weak point in Professor Wilson's theory that he has advanced no adequate explanation why such a transcript should have been required. It is easy to understand that the company may not have wished to part with the 'book' itself, but by 1622 there were already several quartos available containing a respectable text. It was not a case of surreptitious publication, and if the text was often superficially corrupt, it could easily have been corrected. Professor Wilson argues, forcibly enough, that a corrected copy of Q 2 would have afforded 'an impossibly confused and difficult "book"' for the prompter, but that is no reason to suppose that it might not have afforded perfectly satisfactory copy for the printer. If, as I believe, the folio text of *King Lear* was set up from a corrected copy of the very bad quarto, it seems merely wanton to have resorted to transcription in the case of *Hamlet*. To which, of course, the obvious answer is that F 1 does in fact derive from a manuscript and not from Q 2, and that the reason why, at least for an editor, is of secondary importance.

One point of interest is the question whether Shakespeare ever touched up the prompt book. There are a number of readings in Q 2 which, though they make perfectly good sense, are admittedly inferior to the corresponding readings of F 1; while in a few cases the inferior Q 2 reading is supported by Q 1, which suggests that it may have been actually spoken on the stage and have at one time stood in the prompt book. On the other hand, in some instances Q 1 supports F 1, suggesting that the superior reading was found in the prompt book from the start. Some years ago I suggested that in these cases Q 2 represented Shakespeare's 'first shots,' which he subsequently altered in the prompt book either at the time of its preparation or on some later occasion. I was mainly influenced, I think, by a feeling that in some instances both readings are too good, or even too Shakespearian, for either to be plausibly ascribed to chance corruption. It is impossible to doubt that the 'fretfull Porpentine' represents Shakespeare's intention; yet, if this reading had not stood in F 1, no fault could have been found with the excellent 'fearefull Porpentine' of Q 2. However, in view of the list of such readings which Professor Wilson gathers together on p. 149, I feel con-

strained to withdraw my explanation. For it will be observed that in every instance the general form, the graphic outline, of the alternative words is the same. If Shakespeare had chosen to revise a reading in the prompt book he would, we may feel sure, have done so boldly, without regard to formal similarity. The similarity observed can only mean that we have to do either with printers' errors or editorial emendation. What then of the four instances in which Q 1 supports the inferior reading of Q 2? Professor Wilson's explanation is that the prentice-compositor of Q 2, when confronted by a difficulty in Shakespeare's manuscript, sometimes consulted Q 1, and so took over from it certain erroneous readings. This may seem an unnecessarily violent explanation of the four readings in question, which might possibly be due to chance coincidence, but it is supported by so considerable a body of other evidence, in the shape of readings, misprints, and peculiar spellings common to Q 1 and Q 2, that we can hardly escape the conclusion 'that there was some bibliographical connection between the good and bad quartos in the first act.' The theory has the added attraction that it explains what I had observed to be the perplexing fact that the textual links are generally confined to the first act, since the progressive divergence of the texts would later have made the consultation of Q 1 both more difficult and less profitable.

After giving up my own theory of 'first shots' I feel little disposed to admit the one instance in which Professor Wilson is inclined to fall back on it. The passage in question is III, iv, 48-51, where Q 2 reads:

heauens face dooes glowe  
Ore this solidity and compound masse  
With heated visage, as against the doome  
Is thought sick at the act.

For this F 1 has:

Heauens face doth glow,  
Yea this solidity and compound masse,  
With tristfull visage as against the doome,  
Is thought-sicke at the act.

Now, though I do not agree with Professor Wilson's interpretation of the passage—it seems to me to mean simply that heaven blushes and the earth is sick—I am prepared to accept his conjecture that 'Ore' in Q 2 is a misprint for 'And,' and that in F 1 'Yea' is a successful attempt to restore the sense obscured by this badly written word. This attempt he ascribes to Shakespeare himself, who, he suggests, took the opportunity when making it of altering 'heated' to the more significant 'tristfull.' But can 'heated' have been the original reading? According to F 1, which admittedly preserves the correct sense of the passage, the 'visage' belongs to the 'solidity,' whereas the misprint in Q 2 makes it belong to 'heauens face,' and it seems obvious that it is the glowing of that face that suggested the heating of the visage. If so, 'heated' is a reading dependent on the misprint, and cannot be original. That the passage occurs in III, iv, in which it is possible to see Shakespearian cuts, is irrelevant, since, as we have seen, these were probably indicated on the 'foul papers.' Professor Wilson says that he would like to evade this

instance of Shakespeare's interference with the 'book.' I think he need have no scruple

So much for Professor Wilson's bibliographical theory of the origin and relation of the 'good' *Hamlet* texts, which constitutes the first part of his study. The second applies the theory in detail to the editorial problem. Through this I do not propose to follow him. There are many individual points on which I differ—sometimes strongly—but I recognise that Professor Wilson has been through the discipline of editing *Hamlet*, and I have not. I will only make two remarks. One is that over and over again I have found myself at first violently protesting against some proposal or interpretation which on further and more careful consideration I have come to regard at least more tolerantly. The other touches a point of principle in a modernised text. Professor Wilson recognises the linguistic facts concerning the words 'winch' and 'soopstake,' but he elects himself to print 'wince' and 'sweepstake.' I submit that the distinction is here one of linguistic form and not merely of spelling, and that not even a modernising editor has the right to interfere. We shall next find Professor Wilson following his Cambridge predecessors in substituting 'chorister' for 'quinner'!

It is not to be expected that any reader will agree with every argument advanced by Professor Wilson, or that all will endorse even the main outline of his theory. He is himself far too wise to expect it, or to claim more than a reasonable probability for his conclusions. Phrases like 'the foregoing lengthy and, I fear, over-speculative disquisition,' show that he is aware of the inevitable uncertainties of his investigation. The particular 'disquisition' is on the press corrector of Q 2, and it certainly contains some speculations that may give even a friendly critic pause. His explanation of the form '*Ostricke*' for '*Osric*' appears to me to be one of those critical fantasies that give occasion to the Philistine to scoff<sup>1</sup>.

But I have no wish to dwell on points of doubt and difference. I would rather emphasise at once the ingenuity and the general persuasiveness of Professor Wilson's arguments, and recommend that the main lines of his theory and the detailed interpretation with which they are supported should alike receive the attention and respect that are due to the acumen and the indomitable energy of the author. It would hardly be accurate to say that he is the first editor of *Hamlet* who has brought to his task a fully developed theory of the textual facts—though they have been few enough—but he is, I believe, the first whose theory has been based on a thorough and impartial study of the evidence. That alone should place his promised edition in a category by itself.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

<sup>1</sup> There seems no real difficulty here. I know from experience that, where a long secretary 's' is linked to a small letter following, it is often difficult to say whether a 't' is present or not. 'str,' 'ser' and even 'sr' may look very much alike. I see no reason to suppose the intervention of the corrector. In sheet N the name only occurs in the last page and a half (seven times). If the compositor misread it the first time he would go on doing so. By the second page of sheet O, probably set up next day, he had had time to forget his mistake and read it correctly.

*Shakespearian Scraps and other Elizabethan Fragments* By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM New York: Columbia University Press, London: Oxford University Press. 1933 xvi+217 pp. 20s

In this volume Dr Samuel Tannenbaum has collected a number of his papers on Elizabethan subjects of a more or less controversial type. His special qualifications as an expert in Elizabethan handwriting, and in what he chooses to call 'bibliotics,' are widely recognised. In such matters as the identification of Henry Chettle's hand as that of the 'B' script in *Sir Thomas More* he has done valuable service to scholarship.

But, as everyone knows, in the face of what most of us consider the demonstrative proof by A. E. Stamp and others of the genuineness of the disputed Revels Accounts of 1604-5 and 1611-12, Dr Tannenbaum maintains they are a fabrication by J. Payne Collier. The Revels Accounts are not in themselves under discussion in this volume, but they are often referred to, and one cannot avoid the feeling that Dr Tannenbaum is seeking to strengthen the position that he has taken up about them by enlarging the area of Collier's forgeries. Three of the chapters deal with the inscription in a copy of the 1595 *Locrine* signed G.B., and saying that it was written by 'Chas. Tilney', the two notes on the title-page of a copy of *George-a-Greene*, one ascribing it to 'a minister,' and the other to 'Ro. Greene', and the MS dedication and verses addressed to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere in a copy of Sir George Buc's poem *Daphnis Polustephanos* (1605). All of these, according to Dr Tannenbaum, are forgeries by Collier. On p. 185 of this volume he enumerates 'the significant characteristics of forgery.' These are 'a lack of normal carelessness and abandon in the writing process, the presence of evidence of slowness and hesitation, of excessive attention to unimportant and unnecessary details, unnatural stops in the formation of single letters, unnecessary mendings and retouchings; false joinings between letters and improper sequence of strokes. Of these the last is, even by itself, usually sufficient to establish forgery.' One need not be a handwriting expert to see that such criteria, even with the aid of microscopes, chemicals, *et hoc genus omne*, lend themselves to very various interpretations. In *The Library*, December, 1931, Dr Greg has put the case for the above-mentioned inscriptions being in Buc's own hand. How can Dr Tannenbaum expect those who accept the Revels Accounts as genuine to believe that the Buc inscriptions are the work of the same 'forger'?

We are on somewhat different ground in the discussion of the Forman notes on Shakespearian plays. Here there is much to be taken into consideration besides the handwriting. Professor J. Quincy Adams, who writes a foreword to this volume, had on other grounds in his edition of *Macbeth* (1931) declared Simon Forman's account of a performance of *Macbeth* at the Globe on April 20, 1610, to be spurious. The astronomical sign for Saturday is added after the date, which in 1610 was not Saturday but Friday. And Adams thinks that in April the King's Company would still have been playing at the Blackfriars and not at the Globe.

Apart from these and other points in the *Macbeth* entry there are more general considerations advanced by Dr Tannenbaum which throw doubt as well on the other entries concerning performances at the Globe of a non-Shakespearian *Richard II*, April 30, 1611, and *The Winter's Tale*, May 15, 1611, and of *Cymbeline*, where neither the date nor the theatre is specified. These entries are found between folios 200 and 207 b of a MS. volume of 266 pages, Ashmole 208 in the Bodleian. It is curious that neither Anthony Wood, who quoted from this Ashmole MS. in *Athenae Oxonienses* in 1691, nor Joseph Ritson, who mentions a poem by Forman contained in it, nor Philip Bliss, who in his edition of the *Athenae* in 1813-19 quotes some poems from the MS, should have made any allusion to the descriptions of the four plays which together amount to not much less than 200 lines. Against this we have only the statement of Joseph Hunter in his *New Illustrations of the Life, Studies, and Writings of Shakespeare* (1845) that Bliss at the meeting of the British Association at Oxford in the summer of 1832 had called his attention to Forman's notes on the plays. If Hunter's statement is accurate it would be decisive as to the existence of the notes in 1832, but it is odd that he should have waited for over a dozen years before announcing a 'find' of such importance bearing on some of the most disputed of Shakespearian dates.

It was Collier, who in *New Particulars regarding the Works of Shakespeare* (1836) first declared that he had heard of the notes when he was in Oxford six or seven years ago, and had followed a wrong scent in the search for them. But 'not long since a gentleman of my acquaintance, of peculiar acquirements, was employed to make a catalogue of the Ashmolean MSS. only, and he, very unexpectedly, found among them the notes I had anxiously sought in a different direction. He instantly forwarded a copy of them to me. They are contained in the Ashmolean Volume, No. 208.' This is a vague and singular story. In any case, long before the existence of this gentleman of peculiar attainments the Ashmole MSS. had been catalogued in 1697 by Edward Bernard. But his printed list adds to the trouble. It includes as item 8279 'Of Places and Notes thereof, &c. by Simon Forman, an. 1611. 208. 12.' This item reappears in a MS. catalogue of about 1817 by T. Dunbar, Keeper of the Ashmolean. If 'Places' in these catalogues is a mistake for 'Plaies,' there is early evidence that Forman's notes are genuine. But the dotted 'i' is so clear that there can be no question of a misinterpretation by Bernard; the only possibility is a misprint. Dr Tannenbaum denies that there is one, and further argues that Dunbar's list is based on an independent examination of the MS. His conclusion is as follows:

Forman had genuine memoranda, based upon his checkered experiences, on certain places he had visited in England. Collier, casting about for some book contemporary with Shakespeare which he could annotate, saw his opportunity in the word 'Places' and the date '1611' in the Forman diary. He had learned how to remove the writing from a page or sheet of paper by dipping it into or brushing it with certain chemical solutions, perhaps such as are employed in commercial 'ink eradicators,' and then washing away traces of the chemicals. Whole documents have been erased in this

way. To resize the paper afterwards, and to fit it for the reception of his 'Notes' presented no difficulties

In Transatlantic vernacular this is 'a mouthful,' which is not easy to swallow. But the difficulties raised by Dr Tannenbaum and Professor Quincy Adams seem to call for re-investigation. This is also the case with 'the Collier leaf,' with its expanded version of an episode in *The Massacre at Paris*. Mr H. S. Bennett in his recent edition of the play states that 'pending a careful examination of the original, when that becomes possible, the balance of evidence seems to me to be in "favour of the authenticity of the fragment"' Since this was written, the Folger Shakespeare Library has been opened in Washington, and the leaf is available for inspection there. Dr Tannenbaum gives facsimiles of it, and, in pronouncing it a forgery, lays stress on 'one very striking feature in this document.'

Some of the letters and parts of some letters are quite dark, whereas other words and parts of letters are very faint. When the faint strokes are studied with the magnifying glass it is found that they look as if they had been written with a water-color or something resembling it, but with a quill. The dark spots and dark strokes look like ink. If this observation is correct, we have additional evidence of forgery.

We shall doubtless hear whether other experts in handwriting think that 'this observation is correct.' But, in my own opinion, the well-known circumstances in which Collier first announced the discovery of this fragment in 1825 make it suspect.

This volume, however, is not solely occupied with problems of forgery. There is a chapter in which Dr Tannenbaum offers a number of emendations of Shakespeare's text. Whether we accept them or not, and I do not find most of them convincing, they are based on the right principle of seeking to show how corruptions have arisen through the printer's misreading of the dramatist's script. Thus in *Much Ado About Nothing*, v, i, 19,

And sorrow, wagge, crie hem when he should grone

for the first three words Dr Tannenbaum would substitute, 'bid sorrow trugge [trudge]' Among other suggested emendations of famous *crucis* is 'oft adoulter' for 'of a doubt' in *Hamlet*, i, iv, 36-8,

the dram of eale  
Doth all the noble substance of a doubt  
To his owne scandale

In these and other cases Dr Tannenbaum reproduces what he considers to have been the original script of the words, so that readers can at any rate form their own judgments on his suggestions.

And in one chapter on 'Shakespeare's Caste Prejudices' we get clear of all questions of scripts, corruptions or forgeries. This was written as long ago as 1903 in *The Craftsman* in answer to an article by Ernest Crosby on 'Shakespeare's Working-Classes' in the same periodical. Crosby had attacked Shakespeare as writing from the purely aristocratic point of view, and not introducing into his plays any instances of 'serious and estimable behaviour on the part of individuals representing the



lower classes.' Dr Tannenbaum counters this accusation of class-prejudice by citing the case of Posthumus and Imogen in *Cymbeline*, where the Princess 'sets social usages at defiance and allies herself with one of her father's dependents'

What might seem to be an academic question has recently been given 'actuality' by the political passions aroused by the performance of *Coriolanus* in Paris. And Dr Tannenbaum might have found support for his views in some words of Edward Dowden written nearly half a century ago. 'In the play of *Coriolanus* the intolerant haughtiness and injustice of the patrician is brutal and stupid, not less, but rather more, than the plebeian inconstancy and turbulence' To me, at any rate, Dr Tannenbaum is more persuasive when he is discoursing on such a theme than when he is on the trail, hunting for forgeries.

FREDERICK S. BOAS.

LONDON.

*The Plays of John Marston.* In three volumes. Vol I. Edited from the earliest texts with introduction and notes by H. HARVEY WOOD. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd 1934. xlv+246 pp 8s. 6d.

This edition has at least the merit of not taking itself too seriously: it is bad, but it is not pretentious. Mr Wood's aim appears to have been to produce a popular edition—supposing that Marston could ever be popular—for when in his introduction he comes to any real difficulty he passes it by with the excuse that this is no place for discussion. His ideal is a Bullen 'in the newest cut.'

Mr Wood has been at pains to make himself acquainted with the latest writings and research on Marston: he does not appear to have contributed anything of his own, nor can he be said to have woven the yarn supplied by others into any very engaging pattern. The best section of his introduction is that on 'The Plays,' which contains a sensible estimate of Marston as a writer. The rest is hardly adequate. The poetomachia, which, deadly as it is, has made Marston's name more widely familiar than any of his plays, receives hardly more than passing mention; while the Drummond conversations are quoted in seeming ignorance of the work of Penniman and Simpson. *Histrionastix* and *Jack Drum's Entertainment* are casually mentioned as 'early works of Marston's,' without discussing the attributions or indicating whether it is proposed to include the pieces in the present edition. The bibliographical evidence respecting the authorship of *The Insatiate Countess* is imperfectly stated. The question of Webster's share in the 'augmented' *Malcontent* is almost entirely burked: it is futile to consider the evidence of the obviously incorrect title-page apart from that afforded by the head-title. No attempt is made to discuss the intriguing stage history of the play, any more than the curious problems offered by the text. On one discovery Mr Wood is to be congratulated. He has detected in the National Library of Scotland a copy of the *Sophonisba* of 1606 with a variant title hitherto unrecorded.

This he has reproduced as the frontispiece to the present volume—rather strangely, since it does not include the play.

Explanatory notes fill twenty-eight pages of large type at the end of the volume. The lines are not numbered and the only references are to pages, a clumsy arrangement rendered no more convenient by Mr Wood's liability to omit or misprint the page numbers and misplace the notes. These include a certain amount of interesting information, but as a rule Mr Wood, instead of discussing or explaining his author, is content to refer to places, often in periodicals, where others have done so. This is not editing. Moreover, many difficulties—and he admits that Marston is not an easy writer—are passed over in silence; at least there are a number of passages the sense of which is to me obscure, on which he offers no help.

One of the ways in which Mr Wood has sought to bring Bullen up to date is by printing the text in 'old spelling,' that is to say the spelling of the edition he has chosen as the basis of his own. At the same time he modernises the use of *i* and *j* and of *u* and *v*. This seems a futile concession to 'popularity.' It will do little to smooth the path of those to whom the orthography of the early seventeenth century is a stumbling block, while to those who are familiar with it the practice is a constant source of irritation. And while making this petty change, the editor keeps lower-case letters at the beginning of lines, sentences, and even proper names whenever carelessness or shortness of type prompted the original compositor to use them.

The present volume, the first of three, contains the text of three plays, *Antony and Melinda*, *Antony's Revenge*, and *The Malcontent*. The first two depend practically upon a single early source, for the collection of 1633 is textually almost negligible. Suffice it to say that Mr Wood's text seems to be substantially correct, that he has adopted without acknowledgment some of Bullen's emendations and might with advantage (and acknowledgment) have adopted more, and that he has a few interesting conjectures of his own. But of the plays in this volume *The Malcontent* alone affords an editor real opportunity to show his mettle.

Of this there are three early editions, or what may be best called editions—the two that contain the original text, though they sometimes differ markedly, are partly from the same setting of the type, while copies of the third, the 'augmented' version, differ among themselves in a number of readings. These three editions are represented for Mr Wood by the following copies A, Dyce 6250; B, BM. C. 39. c. 25; C, BM. C. 34. e. 17; he has not thought it necessary to examine any others. This order, which I proposed as long ago as 1908 and substantiated in 1921, has not been challenged: why then should Mr Wood write: 'These three copies, without reference to Dr Greg's classification, I have called A, B, and C'? Now, *The Malcontent* is one of those plays whose textual structure is full of difficulties, only to be solved, if at all, by a detailed examination of all available evidence. But Mr Wood's collation of the three texts is perfunctory and incomplete, and is robbed of such little value as it might have possessed by the fact that he frequently forgets which copy he has

decided to call A, which B, and which C! Further, I think that I am right in saying that on only one occasion does he mention the variants presented by different copies of the 'augmented' edition (C). He then prints in his text a perfectly senseless passage, adding at the end of his volume the remark 'most probably the correct reading is that of the other quarto'. Obviously it is but Mr Wood appears to have had only the vaguest notion what 'the other quarto' was. Perhaps he imagined that he was dealing with a variant between A and B, for he failed to record the important fact that the passage is found in C alone. It would seem that he was aware of the variant only because Dr McKerrow mentions it in his *Introduction to Bibliography* in the course of a most ingenious argument on the practice of dictation in the printing house—'not very happily,' Mr Wood rashly remarks.

B is taken as the basis of the text 'I have used B as my original, but have adopted (with acknowledgment) what seem to me to be better and fuller readings from A and C.' The passages that first appeared in C are duly inserted, and are distinguished by asterisks—when the editor remembers to do so. But there is nothing in his text to indicate that C alone supplies the Induction and a long passage at the end of Act i. And if B is the basis, why is the address 'To the Reader' printed from C, and why do fragments of C-text appear sporadically elsewhere? It is, indeed, not always easy to determine what text Mr Wood is following, for his pages are full of misprints. In the course of two short scenes (filling scarce more than two pages) I have counted twenty-eight unrecorded departures from the original, of which not more than eight small differences of punctuation can be attributed to emendation. The rest include 'not unlike' for 'not much vnlike' and 'out of' for 'from out'; while one deliberate alteration deserves the pillory. A and B afford the perfectly satisfactory reading (if the necessary query be supplied):

*Vlsses* absent, O *Ithaca*, can chastest *Penelope* hold out [?]

Mr Wood, by adopting a misprint of C and tampering with the punctuation, produces the nonsense:

*Uliesses* absent, O *Ithacan*, chastest *Penelope*, hold out.

The editor's attitude towards collation appears in such a characteristically impatient note as 'There are in A many minor variants on this paragraph'—a speech of some dozen lines. In fact apart from negligible (and unusually rare) differences of spelling and punctuation, there are only two variants, both important and one probably preserving the correct reading.

Mr Wood reproduces in the main the rather clumsy punctuation of the original, even preserving such accidents and eccentricities as commas and semi-colons at the end of speeches and full stops after questions. On the other hand, his occasional interferences are haphazard and not always happy; and when he feels constrained to introduce a period in the middle of a speech, he neglects to supply a capital after it. He departs from the original, most inconveniently, in printing stage directions in roman (like

the text) except here and there where he inadvertently slips into the more usual practice of italicising. Some entrance directions are for no apparent reason printed in brackets (as is the heading 'Prologue'). Other directions are misplaced, or omitted, or altered without warning one obviously absurd one is left as it stands. There is no attempt to supply necessary exits.

At one point a portion of a speech is unnecessarily taken to be a stage direction, at another some words, which in the original stand within parentheses in the margin, are similarly treated, though they are almost certainly a clumsy addition to the text.

At least once a passage printed as prose in the quarto is silently rearranged as verse, and at least once verse has been improperly reduced to prose. But as a rule rearrangements are suggested by introducing virgules in the text. The suggestions are perfunctory; some passages allowing no satisfactory division into verse are marked, while others more amenable have been overlooked. Four perfectly satisfactory lines of verse are proposed for rearrangement.

The editor has used parentheses to indicate alike letters that should be supplied and letters that should be omitted. He also uses them to distinguish certain minor additions of C, which is unfortunate, since one such addition is already so marked in the original. Elsewhere he notes an addition of B without indicating its extent. In at least one instance he has in his text a reading which, though clearly not intended as an emendation, agrees with no quarto, while the accompanying collations are incorrect. The latter often happens. A reading is quoted as an emendation by Bullen which is in fact found in A, while another emendation of Bullen's is quoted without the reading of A for which it is an emendation (B and C differing). A number of clearly correct suggestions of Bullen's are rejected, and several obvious misprints have been allowed to pass uncorrected<sup>1</sup>. The copy-text is at times either retained or silently misamended when A or C or both afford the correct reading. On the other hand, readings are arbitrarily introduced from C (some of them obvious errors) and a whole line is deliberately omitted (as the collation shows) because the compositor of C accidentally overlooked it. Readings are given as emendations (or as supplied by C) which are in fact those of the copy-text. A passage which first appeared in B is stated to have been 'omitted in A,' implying a critical judgment which may be correct, but for which no reason is advanced. At the same point a line is said to be repeated in C: this is incorrect, it is B that repeats the line. There are in B (not A, as stated) many manuscript notes and emendations in what appears to be a contemporary hand. Of these three are quoted, one incorrectly. Some readings are mere misprints in the present edition.

Altogether a slovenly piece of work, unredeemed by either judgment or

<sup>1</sup> The most important I have noticed is on p. 212 where all three quartos (and Bullen) have the absurd line

Death gues eternitie a glorious breath.

in which the last word should be 'birth' to rime with 'mirth' ('breath' has been accidentally repeated from the third line above).

taste. The only comfort is that it is too obviously defective to interfere with the production of the serious edition which is rather urgently needed.

The volume announces itself as the first of a series of 'Blackfriars Dramatists edited by H. Harvey Wood' It is well printed and attractively bound, but I look forward to its successors without enthusiasm.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

*The Classic Deities in Bacon, a Study in Mythological Symbolism.* By CHARLES W. LEMMI. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Milford. 1933. ix + 224 pp. 12s 6d.

Professor Lemmi has succeeded in establishing, against the tradition of Bacon scholarship, the fundamental thesis of his book on Bacon's treatment of classical mythology; the thesis is an important one, and it is a pity that Professor Lemmi's method of exposition tends to obscure it and to surround it with unnecessary difficulty.

The introduction gives a thorough account of the many interpretations of classical mythology current during the Renaissance, an account useful in contributing to an understanding of the intellectual climate, so to speak, of Bacon's *De Sapientia Veterum*. At the end of the introduction appears the following passage, as it would seem, the central proposition to be sustained by the ensuing discussion: 'More recently it has been said of his mythological exegesis that "a good deal of it seems to be original." I hope to show in the following pages that even this cautious estimate goes too far.' Certainly this declaration seems to deny to Bacon any substantial originality in either the interpretation or the application of the fables, but the reading of a page or two makes it clear that the author cannot mean anything so sweeping. Bacon is given credit for 'skilfully refreshing' a myth, for 'a subtle gift of transmutation,' for elevating and blending 'his acquired conceptions into a loftier and more beautiful whole.' The course of the argument shows Bacon making express the implicit and giving definiteness to the vague in the interpretations of his predecessors. If the work were designed as a study in sources, proving that Bacon had borrowed his whole system, it would be completely unconvincing. The difficulty which Professor Lemmi has himself made is not solved until almost the very end of the book. Professor Lemmi's purpose really is to confute Spedding's declaration in his preface to *De Sapientia Veterum*: 'The object of the work was probably to obtain a more favourable hearing for certain philosophical doctrines of Bacon's own; for it seems certain that the fables could never have suggested the ideas, however a man to whom the ideas had suggested themselves might find or fancy he found them in the fables.' To overthrow this contention it suffices to show that Bacon accepts the methods of interpretation conventional in his time; the argument is strengthened by demonstrating that for many of his ideas Bacon is indebted in detail to others, while others are implicit or indistinctly stated by earlier writers. In fact, the argument against Spedding is triumphantly successful; and it is no small

achievement to make good a central point in the interpretation of Bacon against the authority of Spedding

It is to be regretted that the book is disfigured by misprints. In such a work some are practically inevitable, but there are too many obvious ones here. Fortunately, few are misleading, though some require a little ingenuity for correction. If custom sanctioned it, the accusative should do as well as the nominative in representing proper names. Yet, custom being what it is, Pan's nymph looks more real somehow as *Syrinx* than as *Syringa*. Could one be comfortable if Oedipus solved the riddle of the *Sphinga*?

H. B. LATHROP.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

*The Medium of Poetry.* By JAMES SUTHERLAND. London: The Hogarth Press, 1934. 168 pp. 3s. 6d.

Mr Sutherland in his interesting and modest book is concerned with a close examination of the medium of poetry, and how far it 'influences the mind of the poet, and so, indirectly his poem.' He first makes a close (and perhaps a rather too prolonged) examination of the practice of Wordsworth and Keats, for, as he says, they represent different modes of poetic composition. 'With Wordsworth the theme is almost always the reason for the poem; with Keats it is often no more than the pretext for it.' He shows how Wordsworth felt 'an overwhelming sense of responsibility to a theme as such,' whereas Keats found in it 'simply a way into poetry, a point of departure.' Wordsworth stands for the poets whose work is the result of emotion recollected in tranquillity, while Keats is the representative of those who create rapidly once the initial stimulus has been strong enough to urge them to set pen to paper.

Mr Sutherland establishes this point of view with clarity and excellent choice of examples, and next proceeds to a series of investigations into the part played by metre, form, diction, revision, etc., in the poet's work. Of these, one of the most interesting is that which discusses the metrical form—the tune as Mr Sutherland calls it. This subject, indeed, is as difficult as it is fascinating. We still know so very little of the creative processes, and perhaps less of the problems of communication, that any generalisation is foolish. Every age tries to impose a form upon the practitioners of verse. Elizabethan blank verse; seventeenth-century courtly lyric, the eighteenth-century heroic couplet: all invitingly and dangerously tempted the would-be poet to take his verse form ready made. The gravest charge against the Georgian poets was precisely this (though whether the freedom of Mr Eliot's rhythms is less perilous to young poets than the fetters of Victorian rhythms may be considered an arguable matter). If anything may be hazarded on this dangerous subject it is this: the poet yields to the pressure of a ready-made form at his peril. It may be (and probably is) not the delicate and sensitive instrument which he requires to express his emotions, and it is also most likely to set up a series of irrelevant associations with other uses of the same

metrical pattern. Each poem requires its fitting rhythm, and a series of uneasy experiments, not necessarily even in a sufficiently definite form to be committed to paper, are the frequent prelude to the actual composition. The thought may hammer itself into imperative utterance, as in

For God's sake hold your tongue, and let me love !

or may adapt itself to a conventional form with complete success, as in

Since there's no help, come let us kiss and part.

On the other hand, as M. Paul Valéry has told us, not thoughts but a rhythmical pattern may be the parent of a poem so insistent may the rhythm become that it cries out to be clothed with words.

Mr Sutherland discusses various methods of origination, and ways of writing down the poem once the correct rhythm has been found, and instances the Spenserian stanza as a peculiarly happy example of the sustaining power of a system of rhythm which forces the poet to concentrate on his task, maintains his feelings at a constant pitch of excitement, 'helps him to think poetically, and conversely, prevents him from thinking in prose.' It may be so: but there is some force in the argument that in inventing the Spenserian stanza its creator fettered himself more than he knew. For one thing it encouraged his temperamental diffuseness, it magnificently abetted his refusal to hurry, and its nine-line measure invited an intermittent movement forward by a series of jerks rather than by the unbroken (but not unvaried) tempo which a narrative poem requires.

This one chapter has provoked the above comments and the other chapters are equally full of suggestive and illuminating matter. Mr Sutherland's book will form a useful addition to the comparatively few volumes which give to the young student of poetry a precise and clear discussion of the problem of how a poet communicates his emotions and ideas, and how far they are modified and assisted by the medium in which he works. Finally, Mr Sutherland is to be congratulated on the manner and tone in which he conducts his investigation. At a moment when criticism is far too often conducted by a series of sneers, violent outbursts of opinions misnamed critical judgments, and smug self-satisfied references to a limited number of so-called authorities, it is refreshing to find a critic who writes modestly, clearly and without continuous private jargon as does Mr Sutherland.

H. S. BENNETT.

CAMBRIDGE.

*A Description of the Hand-press in the Department of English at University College, London.* By A. H. SMITH. Privately Printed in the Department of English at University College, London. 1934. 18 pp.

This small quarto contains an account of the making of the hand-press upon which it was printed. This is a full-size working hand-press of an early pattern which has been built by the author for the use of students of bibliography in the Department of English at University College, London.

The design is modelled on the press of Blaew of Amsterdam which is described in Moxon.

The technical account is most interesting and gives us a very clear picture of the press. The author describes the improvements in Moxon's press and adds a section on the adjustment and use of his own press. This collection of technical data forms a valuable record for all students of Bibliography.

Dr Smith hopes to use the press as a 'practical control'· he will go over the ground which the old printers trod hoping in this way to solve the problems in Bibliography which the period of his press has left us. If we think he is too optimistic we must also admit the high purpose which has inspired and guided him.

The inking is the least successful part of a wonderful technical achievement. But no modern printer is ignorant of the vagaries of the modern roller, and ink balls are doubtless stubborn tools.

It is to be recorded that the author has benefited by the inspiration of Professor C. J. Sisson, Lord Northcliffe Professor of Modern English Literature, and by a generous grant from the College Committee. He is himself to be congratulated upon the courage with which he approached his problem and upon the success which he has achieved in the building and working of his press.

OXFORD.

JOHN JOHNSON.

*Die Singweisen Bernarts von Ventadorn.* Von CARL APPEL. (Beiheft 81 zur *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*.) Halle. Niemeyer. 1934. 46 pp. 6 M.

Professor Appel, whose recent death has been noted by all 'provençalistes' with much regret, has completed his great edition of Bernart de Ventadorn by this edition of the eighteen melodies to the troubadour's songs preserved in the MSS *G R. W. X*. These transcripts, together with the photographic facsimiles, thus provide full means for studying the musical ideas of one of the oldest and most famous troubadours and, from a wider point of view, the beginnings of secular song in Western Europe. Concerning many details of the subject uncertainty still prevails, and Professor Appel has avoided any dogmatism in his statements of them, he has provided the materials from which inquirers may draw their own conclusions. The MSS. give merely a succession of notes; they can tell us nothing of keys nor of time nor of pitch, 'so stehen wir den Trobadoredern in jeder Hinsicht in schwieriger Stellung gegenüber.' In some cases different MSS. provide renderings of the same tune that are almost identical; but in other cases versions are so divergent that it is difficult to see a common basis for them. For accent and time signatures we are dependent upon the words, and on these points interpreters are by no means agreed. Thus a considerable field for research and discussion still lies open, and this *Beiheft* will be indispensable to those who are interested in the subject.

CAMBRIDGE.

H. J. CHAYTOR.



*Le Problème Humain. L'idée d'humanité dans Montaigne.* Par FRANÇOIS TAVERA. Paris Champion. 1932 332 pp. 50 fr

No reviewer would be happy with this paradoxical and perplexing book. It would seem that printer, publisher and author had combined to put as many obstacles as possible in the way of the reader and it is to be hoped that no one will judge of French publishing by this extraordinary example of inaccurate presentation. The scores of misprints and misspellings, the slack punctuation, may not be due to the author, but it is more disquieting to find constant misquotation, repetition as tiresome as it is unhelpful to the argument, and a verbosity that runs at times to paragraphs of one sentence over a page in length. A foreign reviewer can only regret that the reputation of the house of Champion no less than that of M. Tavera should have suffered by the distribution of this volume outside France.

For the author this is especially unfortunate, since he has written a book that is by no means worthless. Its merits indeed are those too often absent from literary investigation. He has a real devotion to Montaigne and a dissatisfaction with surface criticism of a great author. He believes (as he says excellently on p. 119) in an interpretation that shall be free at the same time as exact, and that shall define a system of thought by striving to grasp its real 'tendance.' In attempting this for Montaigne he is frequently suggestive, clear-sighted and helpful. His description of Alceste, for example, as the incarnation of what is finest in the *Essais* (p. 290), his parallels with Renan and Nietzsche, his claim for a dogmatism behind the sceptical attitude of his author (pp. 7, 70), these and many similar points show him refreshingly aware of the range and complexity of his subject.

Furthermore he has eschewed mention of authorities in order to keep the individual development of his theme, and this also would be admirable if one could feel that he was conversant with the real Montaigne as the remorseless investigation of the last thirty years has revealed him. Yet M. Tavera's main contentions seem impaired by his ignorance in this regard. In the central chapters, devoted to religion, he is satisfied to deal with the Montaigne of Sainte-Beuve, that is with an independent writer whose sources and relations to his time are almost entirely unexplored. He speaks (p. 128) of the 'banalité écœurante' of Montaigne's references to religion, instancing his monotonous formulæ, such as 'comme dit S. Augustin.' But this judgment would be impossible for anyone who has gone carefully into the sources of the *Apologie de Sebond* as M. Villey has revealed them, and who consequently realises that an important part of that essay is indebted to close reading of the *City of God*. Similarly M. Tavera is satisfied with the 'Montaigne joue la comédie' of Sainte-Beuve, a summary which most scholars would surely now pronounce so inadequate as to be misleading, and which the critic could hardly have uttered if he had known the habits of thought of the sixteenth century as they are now known.

Such conclusions form the theory that conditions the whole argument of this book. The author believes the human attitude to be necessarily

and finally contradictory to religion. He defines it (p. 299) as 'l'idée de la nature qui se suffit et qui doit se suffire,' while the vital principle of religion is 'l'insuffisance de l'homme à faire lui-même sa destinée.' Hence Montaigne as champion of the human attitude was an enemy of religion. His respectful references to it are 'pure concession verbale et simplement extérieure', his real attitude is that of 'incrédulité instinctive .. paganisme fervent' (p. 135).

To my mind this distinction is in itself confused and inapplicable to Montaigne, but to show this with any adequacy would lead us too far. It is a significant sidelight on French intellectual history that free exercise of the intellect can still be claimed to be incompatible with dogma and religious truth, and the claim leads M. Tavera to be unjust to Pascal (pp. 192sq.) as well as to the general view of Montaigne just mentioned. That view does not seem to me to fit the facts with anything like the closeness of that made familiar to us by the researches of M. Busson, who showed Montaigne to be one of many thinkers of the later French Renaissance who were unable to reconcile the conflicting claims of reason and faith, yet refused to give up either. We may admit that Montaigne's religious thought was neither original nor profound, it is too late in the day merely to dismiss it as polite insincerity.

Indeed would not M. Tavera's own formula of 'la nature qui se suffit' have been attacked by Montaigne as suspiciously like the glorification of reason that formed the target of his greatest essay? He believed of course in human nature, in that 'faculty of godlike reason' which was the rediscovery of the Renaissance, but the paradox of his message is one with which M. Tavera never really comes to grips, that what is human is incapable of attaining reality: man must be satisfied with the relative and not presume to grasp the absolute. This is at bottom a religious position. Montaigne's finest passages treat of the shortcomings of man. 'Par le sentiment de nostre petitesse, rudesse, vanité, mesmes aussi perversité et corruption nous reconnoissons que la vraie grandeur, sapience, verité, justice et pureté gist en Dieu.' That is no inaccurate summary of much of Montaigne's essays although it was written by Calvin.

W. G. MOORE.

OXFORD.

*A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century.* By H. C. LANCASTER. Part II. The Period of Corneille. Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press. 2 vols. 804 pp. 55s. 6d.

This is the second instalment of a work already well known, and which it would be superfluous to praise in detail, since Part I was welcomed in this *Journal* by Mr Tilley with more authority and felicity than I can command. No less than the first two, these volumes present the result not only of considerable personal labour, but of a school of research which has thrown much new light on the subject which Mr Lancaster has made his own. In undertaking to write its history, he has embarked on a task so immense as to make divergence of view inevitable, and I am anxious that the criticisms prompted by a careful reading should not leave any doubt

as to the admiration I share with Mr Tilley for the thoroughness and scholarly workmanship constantly in evidence

The author studies with a fullness hitherto unattempted the dramatic output of sixteen important years (1635-51) Upwards of 280 plays have been read, summarised, their sources investigated, and the text even of the most obscure closely examined The result is a mass of new data that allows particular men and works to be seen in something like true perspective. Statistics given at convenient points in the book (e.g., pp 572, 623) are most informative. Taking tragedy alone, we have 48 plays written in the five years preceding 1643, 36 in the next five, but in these years the production of tragi-comedy fell below that of tragedy, which seems to testify to the influence of Corneille The question of foreign influence is renewed by the comparison of so much material That of Italy was by no means negligible, that of Spain responsible for the plots of a good many plays but limited in the main to comedy (p. 428). Perhaps, too, more importance should be assigned to the influence of actors on the writing and construction of plays suited to them Remarkable instances of this are given (pp. 40, 63, 166) which go some way to support Scudéry's taunt that the Infanta was given a considerable part in *Le Cid* chiefly to accommodate a second actress. It is impressive, again, to note the continued influence of fiction on play-writing Mr Lancaster does not always seem to recognise that in 1640 the theatre took the place of the novel in many respects, and supplied interest in theme and plot rather than study of character. More important than these single points is perhaps the evidence that the better known plays of the period were part of an intense production, which included many others of real quality and skilful construction. Parallels are drawn between situations or phrases found in the great authors and in their contemporaries, and these are most instructive when direct influence is not in question. They are proof of concern with similar subjects and ideas and are indispensable to real acquaintance with the period.

On the whole Mr Lancaster is as accurate as he is detailed in his treatment of such a mass of material. He has had in many cases to work on faulty and misleading authorities, and has solved his problems in the only successful way by direct reference to the earliest published sources. His bibliographical work seems excellent and after testing a good many of his findings, the points of fact on which one is obliged to differ from him are surprisingly few. The dates of Scudéry's published plays, for instance, could in some cases be corrected from M. Mongrédien's bibliography in *RHL* for 1933; the chief divergence seems to be in connexion with *L'Amour Tyrannique*, where Mr Lancaster (p. 229 n.) seems to list as editions of 1639 those of which M. Mongrédien has found a number of copies bearing the date 1640. The point is perhaps worth separate investigation. The account of Desmarets' *Mirame* needs supplementing from the MS. quoted at length by M. Magne in his *Voyure et l'Hôtel . . . Les Années de Gloire*, pp. 208-12. I do not understand the reference to *Alexis* at the top of p. 574; surely Mr Lancaster is conversant with the French versions of the legend? Finally the analysis of *Pertharite* seems to me more

or less invalidated by serious misunderstanding of the character of Rodelinde (pp. 696-8).

But it is not so much in the details as in the implications of his method that difficulties arise with Mr Lancaster's *History*. Such painstaking, piecemeal consideration of plays in chronological and analytical compartments is more suited to one period than to another, to indiscriminate second-class material than to a succession of great plays. One's misgivings as to this method increase as the *History* approaches the masters of the genre it studies, and it is not only the great author like Corneille or Rotrou but the complexity of literary evolution that suffers by such treatment. To take one after another the tragedies, tragi-comedies and comedies of say half a dozen years is not necessarily to write the dramatic history of those years. What becomes for example of the theory and criticism that accompanied dramatic production? There can hardly have been an age when thoughts and discussions about dramatic technique had so much bearing upon what was produced, yet we have La Mesnardière mentioned only casually (p. 386 n.) and d'Aubignac, although frequently quoted, not seriously treated. (Surely it would be more intelligible to consider the first passage quoted on p. 19 as written before and not after the edict of 1641?) One of the things we most want to know about the thirty years preceding *Andromaque* is how the tragic style came to be so firmly established. Yet this also has apparently no place in the *History*.

In other ways I get an increasing impression through these two volumes that the subject is larger and deeper than Mr Lancaster seems to make it. One might almost say that he writes the exterior history of dramatic literature. He analyses plot, sources, construction; his authorities are chiefly technical, never elucidatory. He frequently implies that a play has been 'studied' by the investigator of its material, not by Rigal or Brunetière who have tried to unravel its meaning. Interpretation, as he recognises, is a part of history, yet it is relegated to a very minor place. The analyses of the greater plays of Corneille might well have been fuller and less superficial if secondary facts had been curtailed or arranged more succinctly. There are cases of repetition (concerning the prefaces of La Calprenède, p. 254), five pages were not necessary for the sources of *Héracles*, and the dating of Thomas Corneille's plays could have been settled in a note.

It is a pity that the chapter on *Le Cid*, the centre of gravity of these two volumes, is an unfortunate illustration of method. It opens with a page of polemic on the date of the first performance that does not materially advance or settle the question. (The 'refutation' of M. Reynier does not convince me, and we still have to agree with Marty-Laveaux that we do not know the exact date.) After an able account of Corneille's relation to Castro, there is a discussion of the structure and form of the play that I find curiously uncertain. It does not help a student to be told that 'the form is derived primarily from the French classical movement, already exemplified by plays of Mairet, Tristan and others...' and then three pages later that it was 'admirably adapted to the taste of a French audience of 1637 when the tragi-comedy was still the most popular genre'

(p. 128). Both statements may be true, but they need careful explanation. Mr Lancaster never comes to grips with the nature of the play or attempts to show how or why it was a tragi-comedy or a tragedy. The matter is more than one of nomenclature, since *Le Cid* is exceptionally complex, and if it is in the main a tragi-comedy, while paying attention to certain of the new rules, it should hardly be judged on the strict standard of verisimilitude that Mr Lancaster applies. With regard to its psychology he is content to apply the old summary of the conflict between love and honour, which again is confusing and hardly correct. As Lanson (*Esquisse*, p. 84 and elsewhere) and more recently Klemperer (*Cornille*, p. 194) have shown, neither Rodrigue nor Chimène is really faced with such a conflict. They are concerned with being true to honour for love's sake, which is something much more complex, idealistic and romantic.

It is at such points in the work that one regrets that the historian has not gone more deeply into the forces working upon French drama in this critical period of its development. Phenomena such as the unities or the tragi-comedy are not stereotyped and external, but evidence of temperamental preference. The unities are more than rules arbitrarily imposed, 'toute une esthétique est attachée aux trois unités' as Lanson illuminatingly says (*Esquisse*, p. 68). The tragi-comedy surely represents a temperament that was violently in conflict with this 'volonté d'art,' and which gloried in incident and rhetoric. *Le Cid* is a symbol of the drama of its century in its combination of this temperamental energy with severity of plan and form.

W. G. MOORE.

OXFORD.

*French the Third Classic: An Inaugural Lecture given at the University of Edinburgh on October 10, 1933.* By JOHN ORR. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1934. 31 pp. 1s.

Why are 'the Classics' so called? It was not so long ago, only in the early seventeenth century, that they received their honoured name. It had from the outset a distinctly pedagogic or educational flavour. It meant 'high-class,' in comparison with other Greek and Latin writings. And it also meant 'used in or belonging to the classes of colleges and schools.' Since the Greek and Latin authors read in class were in fact the best or 'classical' writers in these languages, there was double virtue in the name. Soon extended to the languages themselves, as opposed to the modern tongues, it cast over them a halo which illumines them still. 'The Classics' are not, they never were, exactly Greek and Latin. They are Greek and Latin as studied and as taught in universities and schools—a body of select literature expounded with that peculiar combination of accumulated learning, nice scholarship and sound teaching traditions which has no need of description or commendation here. The prestige attaching to the name is in fact due not so much to qualities inherent in Greek and in Latin, as to the spirit in which these two languages have been studied and taught. In the literature and language of France it is assuredly not difficult to discover qualities essentially 'classical.' Neither

is it difficult to conclude that, subjected to the same scholarly treatment as Greek and Latin, studied and taught in the same spirit, French, too, is among the Classics. It is a high status to claim for so recent an academic discipline. But what Professor of French, meditating on the possibilities of his subject, can be content with a lower?

Certainly not Professor John Orr, who has devoted his Inaugural Lecture at Edinburgh to a demonstration of the 'classical' qualities of French and, in the title, calls a spade a spade and French 'the third Classic'. Though his title strikes the note of challenge, he is careful in the text not to spoil a good case by overstating it. It would no doubt have been possible—by playing a little upon the name and much exceeding the time-limit for lectures—first to set forth all that 'Classic' connotes, and thereafter demonstrate that 'French' means the same thing, if not point by point, then on balance. Professor Orr prefers the paths of moderation and contents himself with showing, most persuasively and with striking examples in support, that French and the ancient Classics have at the least many features in common.

Thus, one characteristic of the Classics is Universality. French can claim some also. And not merely in modern times. The exordium of the lecture is provided by an incident of the early thirteenth century. When the Count's daughter of Ponthieu, fleeing from her Saracen lord and husband, the sultan of 'Aumarie,' is warned by her mariners that the wind is bearing them straight for Brindisi: 'Let the ship go freely,' she replies, 'for I know French and shall lead you safely everywhere.' The tale is mythical, but the remark was true. In 1783 Frederick of Prussia made no truer, nor Rivarol, inditing then his prize essay on the congenial theme of Universality. It might indeed be objected that this particular thirteenth-century case is inconclusive. Reference to the text shows that the heroine was an exceptionally gifted linguist. She spoke *sarrasinois* fair and featously at 'Aumarie,' where, moreover, her shipwrecked father could find no one else to speak French to him. And Version B of the story has an unfortunate, though perhaps spurious, addition: 'car jou sai parler françois et autre langage, si vous conduirai partout'. But there are better known, if less entertaining, O.F. passages which leave no doubt as to O.F. universality, notably the hackneyed one in *Chgès* (which also shows that in Chrétien's mind French was already 'the third classic').

Another characteristic of the Classics is their close connexion with Class Reading which was of course apparent in the Middle Ages, but which so impressed the early seventeenth century. In so far as 'Classic' means 'used in or belonging to the classes of colleges and schools,' the term is now no longer peculiar to Latin or Greek. On that point Professor Orr's statistics are clear. In 1933, out of some twenty thousand candidates for the School Certificate (Joint Matriculation Board) 18,728 offered French as one of their subjects and 8179 offered Latin. In the Higher School Certificate Examination 1971 took French as a principal subject and 190 took Latin. These significant figures he quotes without exultation, but without alarm, and over Latin in the universities he draws a prudent, and over Greek at all stages a merciful, veil.

Difficulty has always been accounted a merit of the Classics. Professor Orr, like his predecessor Professor J. M. Moore, to whose memory he pays an eloquent tribute, is no believer in soft opinions, and even finds in Difficulty a positive educational value. He has some excellent remarks, for example, on the writing of French prose and the chastening effects of that exercise not merely on Smith major, but on a greater than he, on M. Meillet, for our chief contemporary linguist is aptly quoted as saying 'Il faut n'avoir pas conscience des difficultés pour se résigner sans trembler à écrire quelques lignes de français'.

The Classics are free from all reproach of Modernity. But 'modern' is a relative term—and so is 'ancient'. What was the Greek *Grammaticus* but a modern language teacher performing in Rome his beneficent, nay, his civilising, task? And where does Latin cease and French begin? What French philologist can safely dismiss Plautus from his ken? To which questions we add one of our own, in defence of Modernity and of the Modern Humanities. Is not French thought the basis of present-day civilisation?—and cite Professor Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, p. 22: 'This great French age of Thought [the eighteenth century] has remade the presuppositions of the civilised world.'

Professor Orr sums up his case by saying that French can justly claim to rank among the Classics, by the place it has held for eight hundred years officially or unofficially in our schools, by its order, harmony and stability, by its innate inalienable qualities yet further 'classicised' by generations of writers and scholars intent upon perfecting their native tongue, above all by the mental discipline which it provides. And here we return to the pedagogic or educational considerations from which we started and which are also the conclusion of the whole matter. French is a Classic, when taught as such—as it was taught by Professor Moore and evidently will be by his successor.

R. L. G. RITCHIE.

BIRMINGHAM.

*Le Opere di UGO FOSCOLO* Edizione Nazionale. Volume VII. *Lezioni, Articoli di Critica e di Polemica* (1809–1811), edizione critica a cura di EMILIO SANTINI. liii+484 pp. Volume VIII. *Prose politiche e letterarie* (1811–1816), edizione critica a cura di LUIGI FASSÒ. cxxix+409 pp. Firenze: Le Monnier. 1933. Each L. 50.

Half-way through the last century Orlandini and Mayer, filled with enthusiastic devotion for the memory of Foscolo, dedicated many years of their lives to the production of what they believed to be a definitive edition of his works. Despite the deficiencies of that edition, its very existence deterred others from undertaking the same task until recent years, when Fascist appreciation for the patriot-poet has led to the production of a national edition conducted with all the exacting care and discrimination of modern critical method. An influential committee under the chairmanship of Vittorio Cian is engaged in the production of twenty volumes of which those including the prose works falling within

the period 1809-16, now under review, are the first to appear. Others are in active preparation and several may be expected shortly.

Foscolo described himself as 'scrittore tardo, difficile, copiatore e ricopiatore,' and those not familiar with his scribbled, blotted, goose-quill calligraphy may get some idea of the problems of interpretation imposed on his editors by studying the page of MS. reproduced on p. 274 of Santini's volume. This is but one of their difficulties! Foscolo had a habit of describing as completed works which had not advanced beyond their first conception, and which probably never found expression on paper. Modern editors have, nevertheless, to apply the acumen of Sherlock Holmes and the patience of Job in a search for these disembodied creations of Foscolo's imagination, despite any conviction they may have as to their purely fanciful existence. Other difficulties which have confronted the editors have been the confused arrangement of the MS. collections at Leghorn and Florence and the inaccuracies of the previous editions. Despite these handicaps there is no doubt that the present editors are doing all that is humanly possible to give us Foscolo's writings in their best form.

Probably the most interesting inclusions in vol. VII are the lectures delivered by Foscolo during his short tenure of the Pavia professorship; splendid examples of his originality and eloquence. The *Orazione inaugurale* is taken from the first Milanese edition of 1809 with the addition of certain improvements made by the author in MS. marginal notes found in a copy of this edition preserved in the Biblioteca comunale of Udine. A useful piece of work has been done by Santini in sifting the evidence for the Foscolian contributions to certain articles published in Rasori's *Annali di Scienze e Lettere* (1810-12). The article on Caro and Alfieri as translators of Virgil is shown to be by Michele Leoni although of Foscolo's inspiration. Giovanni Rasori, Pietro Borsieri, Luigi and Silvio Pellico are others who developed Foscolo's ideas in various articles. Apparently the poet would throw off a series of ideas in conversation which one of his circle of admirers would set down in the form of an article. Later he would revise and correct the written pages. The precise amount of Foscolo's contribution is a problem to which the editor of vol. VII has given considerable attention.

The second volume under review contains, besides less important matter, the interesting fragments (some 60 pages) intended for a life and rehabilitation of Machiavelli; the *Hypercalypseos*; and the considerations arising out of the collapse of the Regno d' Italia collected under the title *Della Servitù dell' Italia*. What little was written of the intended work on Machiavelli was left by Foscolo in a chaotic condition. Orlandini and Mayer attempted to arrange the MSS., often quite arbitrarily, to form some kind of connected whole. Fassò has broken up this pretended unity and arranged the fragments to illustrate the actual evolution of the work. The first part now consists of ideas arising from a refutation of a certain Angelo Ridolfi who held that the *Principe* reflected the real opinions of Machiavelli and was not intended satirically. Foscolo, as is well known, believed the contrary and considered that the book was written 'obli-



quamente.' The second part contains a further version of the same matter, but relegating Ridolfi to the background and dealing generally with more important criticisms, especially that of Roscoe in his *Life and Pontificate of Leo X*. There follow various attempts at a study of Machiavelli's life and historical background. The present text is a great improvement on the old not only in arrangement but also in accuracy—no more, for example, are we given a page of Roscoe in Italian as though by Foscolo!

The text of the *Hypercalypseos* has not called for such drastic revision, though by using Foscolo's *corrigenda* the editor has been able to improve the Latin and thus remove much of the justification for Manzoni's ironic comment on the subject of Foscolo's faulty Latinity in this work.

In a lengthy consideration of the *Della Servitù dell' Italia*, Fassò makes a very useful contribution to our knowledge of the part played by Foscolo in Milan in 1814 and of the immediate reasons for his voluntary exile. Although he was not politically implicated in the events of April 20 of that year, the editor considers Foscolo as playing a *pars magna* in the military conspiracy hatched in the previous few weeks aiming at independence under Beauharnais or Murat. As with the *Machiavelli*, the *Della Servitù dell' Italia* began as a polemic and developed, or was intended to develop, along historical lines. The work was, however, left unfinished and in confusion. Here too the present editor has greatly improved the text as previously known by frankly admitting its fragmentary condition.

Amongst the lesser writings included in vol. VII we would call attention to Foscolo's notes on Alamanni, Rucellai and Tansillo, as not hitherto published.

In considering the editing of vol. VIII it seems that Fassò has underestimated the value of Orlandini and Mayer's work which he forgets was done under the very different conditions of 80 years ago. It is irritating to be reminded constantly of their deficiencies by one who does not hesitate to talk of his own 'doverosi scrupoli.' The difference between the new and the antiquated edition is plain to careful readers and the considerable merits of the modern editor can well speak for themselves.

E. R. VINCENT.

OXFORD.

*Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Sudschweiz.* Von K. JABERG und J. JUD. Bd IV, herausgegeben von J. Jud (Schlaf und Toilette—Krankheit und Heilung—Moralische Eigenschaften und Affekten—Soziales und Religiöses Leben). Zofingen (Schweiz): Ringier. 1932. 209 maps. 220 Sw. frs.

The first three volumes of the *AIS* were the joint work of both editors; they have now decided to divide up the work differently and Professor Jud is thus responsible for editing the whole of the material contained in this volume. Its 209 maps are distributed as follows. Riposo e Toiletta 643–675, Malattie e Guarigione 676–709, Difetti, Qualità morali e Sentimenti 710–732, Vita religiosa e sociale 733–851, the last-named division containing such important sections as Amusements, School, Church, Superstitions and Folklore, and the Village and the Market-place.

In a valuable introduction the editor points out the particular interest of this volume in the amount of morphological and syntactical material it provides, and in the light it throws upon not only the distribution but also the origin of some of the peculiar features of Italian morphology, old and modern, particularly of the standard verbal endings and the conjugation of irregular and auxiliary verbs. To take a single example, the map 'ci leviamo' (660) would appear to discredit the accepted theory of the origin of the ending *-iamo*, which, cartographically, seems to reveal itself as a fusion of two rival endings *-imo* and *-amo* (cf. Fr. *-ions*), a fusion favoured, doubtless, by the fact that it avoided, in the first conjugation, all confusion with the corresponding form of the preterite, and not, as propounded by Meyer-Lubke, an analogical formation due to *stramo*.

There is also, as we should expect from the field of human activity here represented, a great deal of ethnographical and folklore material, not only in the maps listed under the heading 'Superstitions and Folklore' (811-816), but also in such maps as 'l' epilessia' (678), 'giocare a mosca cieca' (743), 'l' Epifania' (772), 'il ceppo di Natale' (782), 'la raganella' (789, a model ethnographical map this, with its very complete illustrations). But the bulk of the information here set forth, with a clarity which we are apt now to take for granted, without realising the immense labour and care its achievement has involved, is still, as in the preceding volumes, lexicographical. And, as heretofore, I shall confine myself to this, and endeavour to point out a number of etymological problems which a first acquaintance with some of the maps reveals or helps to elucidate.

'E coricato' (659).

The home of this rather peculiar form of *collocatum* would appear to be the south. The Tuscan dialects, in the main, avoid the word. *L-* and *r-*forms alternate in the centre, but in the south the *r-*forms are quite supreme. But the map has a further immediate interest in its bearing upon the origin of Italian *sdraiato*. A number of the dialect variants of this word can only be explained on a basis of *sterno*, *stratum*: e.g. *stratato* at pt. 572, *strateto* at 546, etc. *Strayyato*, at 565, gives us an intermediary between these and the literary form, which of course must be explained in conjunction with its neighbours. We are thus compelled to discard the *disrariare* basis of the *REW*, which, unsatisfactory enough for the standard form, is quite inadequate to explain the dialect cognates, and to look to a *stratare* with, in the case of *sdraiare*, an interference of some other word, possibly of Germanic origin, e.g. a Gothic *dragan*, 'to stretch' or 'to draw,' equivalent to modern German *tragen*, a hypothesis which pt. 590 seems to confirm with its variant *stragar*.

'Sedersi, siediti, sedetevi' (662, 663, 664):

Interesting maps in the evidence they give of the inadequacy of *sedere*, and of its early reinforcement by derivation: *seditare* (*seditare* even) and *sedentare* (cp. Spanish *sentar*). This is not the only case which seems to hint at an instability of intervocalic *d* in certain strata of Vulgar Latin speech, and the question would be well worth investigating. One notes, further, that the forms of *seditare* have been in some cases so reduced as to enter into conflict with *stare*, and as *seditare* occurs both north and south of Tuscany one more than suspects the bona fides of Tuscan *sedere*. It is possible that an early *seditare* has disappeared in this area, after having got too close to *stare*, and that the contact has left its trace at pt. 532 where *sta a sedere* equals *sedersi*.

'Spogliarsi' (669):

The contact of *dispoliare* with *dispeduculare* (cp. Genovese *despigognà*, 'spidocchiare,' and *despuggà*, 'spohare,' according to Casaccia), which it is interesting to observe on

the French map 'se déshabiller' (ALF 394), does not seem to have taken place in Italy except at a few points 155, 163, 172 and 179 (?) and of these 155 seems to put up with the clash, while the others give us *disvestirsi*. In France, *déshabiller* has eliminated *dépouiller* to a considerable extent, although the latter has left its mark on its victor in the numerous *débiller* forms. French *dépouiller* in 'dépouiller un texte' shows a happy hiding-place for *dispeduculare* in the home of *dispholare*. The disappearance of *dispholare* over a great part of the north of the peninsula is due no doubt to a desire for a more concrete form of expression, hence, perhaps, the numerous *disvestire*, *cavar fuori*, and *trarre fuori* forms, though the last may not be uninfluenced by the neighbouring German *ausziehen*. Other considerations, such as the feeling of indelicacy which words like 'strip' and 'undress' arouse, may also have contributed to the evident downfall of *dispholare*.

#### 'Solleticare' (682)

A very varied picture, inasmuch as the idea 'to tickle' lends itself to a more or less spontaneous creation of picturesque forms based upon immediate sound values. The primitive noises of the nursery, for example, here play a conspicuous part (*fa cikh cikh*, pt. 720, *fa kikhkikh*, 719) and the result is a great freedom of phonetic treatment with all sorts of onomatopœic and hypochoristic variations on the traditional theme. But we must clearly avoid postulating uniformity in the inherited basis. The progress from Latin to Romance, particularly in this type of word, is not necessarily a progress from uniformity to diversity, but may be either from a lesser variety to a greater or from a greater to a lesser, according to dates and regions.

To confine ourselves to Italian *solleticare*, we are obliged when reading this map in conjunction with the French map 'chatouiller' (ALF 253) to reject the association of *solleticare* with Latin *titillare*. Tuscan *far solletico* cannot be dissociated from the forms *far susclergos*, *susalergos*, *suselego*, etc., surviving in southern central France. The basis of both groups is Latin *sollicitare* (cp. Ovid, *Met*, xi, 169. *tum stamina* ['the strings'] *docto Pollice sollicitat*), or rather *solliticare*, with, for this word, a characteristic reduplication of the initial syllable in the Provençal forms. The metathesis of the *t* and *k* has a parallel in *étinceller* from *scintillare*. In both cases the anticipatory pronunciation of the *t* may well have been prompted by an instinctive preference for the sound value of *t* as against *k* as a vehicle of the idea or, if a more orthodox interpretation be preferred, by the sublatent suggestion of *titillare* on the one hand and *stella* on the other. English *tickle*, as against dialect *kittle* and the kindred Germanic forms with initial *k*, inclines one to lean to the earlier hypothesis. We note, finally, the frequency of 'cat' forms and derivatives. This leads us to accept French *chatouiller* (O.F. *chatiller*) as one of these, as well as German *kitzeln* and its cognates.

#### 'Salassare' (706):

The etymology < *sanguem laxare* is supported by Diez's O Port. *sanguileissado* and by certain forms on the northern periphery of this map, e.g. *lasciar sank* at pts 9 and 29, and *sanglascié* at 305, etc., cp. English 'to let blood.' But the shortening presupposed by the accepted etymology is none the less astonishing, especially when we compare this and the 'sanguisuga' map (458). The shortening can be accounted for, to some extent, if we take into account (a) that this is clearly a northern word, (b) that it has crossed with *solaciare*, to which the numerous *sulasar* and *solasar* forms bear witness, though whether this crossing is early or late it is difficult to determine. It should be remembered that in Latin the word *solacium* may have a technical therapeutic meaning (cp. *haec sunt solacia*, *haec fomenta summorum dolorum*, Cic. *Tusc.*, i.1, Lewis and Short), and that bleeding is an accepted expedient for giving 'relief.' It is therefore not impossible that *solaciare* may have taken on the specialised meaning of 'to bleed' at a very early date, just as French *se soulager*, and, according to Petrochi, at one time, Italian *sollazzare*, shows in its erotic use another specialisation of the idea 'to find relief.' One suspects that in the baser circles of Vulgar Latin society the ideas conveyed by *solacium* and *salax* were fairly contiguous, and that this fact too may not be without its bearing on the history of the word.

#### 'Indovinare' (746)

The REW bears no rubric indicating a survival of Latin *numen*. It seems impossible

to account for a number of the central and southern words for 'to guess' otherwise than by an *adummnare*, and as these go right up to Tuscany they may have played their part in the history of *indovinare*

'La bambola' (750):

This map raises quite a pretty problem of semasiology and etymology. Here, and on the corresponding French map (*ALF* 1074), the 'doll' in a great number of dialects is called 'a teat'. Indeed the old word *pup(p)a*, which is found from Sicily to Belgium, means in various areas 'teat' as well as 'doll'. Which is the fundamental, which the derived meaning? And what part does *pupa* in the sense of 'larva' play in the scheme? To the first question one can answer unhesitatingly that 'teat' is the fundamental and 'doll' the derived meaning. The domain of child-rearing, the domain of crooning and gurgling, is a domain of primitive sound values. *Puppa*, for 'nipple,' is as fundamental from the point of view of sound values as is 'teat' and 'titty' and Greek *τιθήνη*, they are both essentially based upon sucking sounds, one bi-labial, the other linguo-dental. How then are we to explain the transference of meaning from 'teat' to 'doll'? The intermediary is the dummy teat or 'comforter' given to children to suck. This, before the advent of the rubber article, was composed (and still is, cp. Littré, s.v. *Suçon*) of a piece of rag tied round a nucleus of sweetened bread, etc., with enough spare cloth attached to avoid all risk of its being swallowed by the aspiring infant. The shape of this is exactly that of the rag doll or *pope di pèces* portrayed in Haust's *Dichonmarre Lœgeois*, and of the 'dolly' used in English households for staining water blue. The writer has heard the term 'dolly' applied to the rag 'comforter' (cp. for the association Wright's *Dialect Dictionary*, s.v. *Tittydol*). In Anjou (cp. Von Wartburg, *FEW*, s.v. *brunna*) *brone* means 'breast' and *broneau* is the name of the child's 'dummy.' *Poupée*, according to Littré, means, as well as 'doll,' a piece of rag used to suckle calves. *Puppa*, therefore, first a teat, came to be used for the 'dummy,' then the rag doll, which is frequently the same thing to the omnivorous infant, before becoming a general term for 'doll'. This, it should be remarked, and not the collective value of the suffix *-ée*, as Gamillscheg suggests, gives the most satisfactory explanation of the ending of French *poupée*, which is thus a verbal derivative from *pouper* 'to suck' and on all fours with *tétée*.

From the rag doll, shaped like a child in swaddling-clothes, to the sense of 'pupa,' 'larva' (cp. Remacle: *Poupeye*, 'nid de larves du hanneton') is an easy step. No comparison could be more apt, and indeed there are frequent 'larva' words on the 'bambola' map, cp. pt. 190, *bugata*, etc. But if *pu(p)pa* means 'larva' and 'doll,' and Tuscan *bambola* is surrounded by 'larva' words, may we not be forced to a new etymology of Italian *bambola* and with it of *bambo* and *bambino*? Let the map guide us. To the east of the *bambola* area the doll is called *bambósa* (pts. 490, 478, etc.) close to *bugata* (499, 437) and in 479 *bumbósa*. We are thus compelled to take into account *bombyx*, *bombax*, 'silkworm,' 'cocoon' (v. *REW*, 923, 1202), and *bambax*, and to see in *bambola*, *bambo* and *bambino* some kind of off-shoots of these words and not the descendants of some mysterious 'Schallwort' *bamb* as the *REW* proposes, in other words to establish a definite semantic relationship between Italian *bambino* and French *poupon*. The elaboration of this problem, which I hope to take up elsewhere and can here merely outline, would entail an investigation of the present map in conjunction with 'il seno' (126), 'il capezzolo' (127), and 'il bruco,' together with the relevant French material. We can even at this stage, however, draw a useful lesson, namely, that etymologies based upon linguistic geography are forced upon us by a complex of fact, and, like words themselves, have a community value, whereas those resulting from speculation upon an isolated word are often but the ungoverned offspring of individual fancy. Not that the element of surprise need be lacking in the geographical etymologies. To take a further instance, arising out of this self-same complex. On the map for 'poupée' (*ALF* 1074) there appears, at various points, *guenon* (70) and *gueniche* (66, 69, etc.). This group has inspired a number of more or less fantastical etymologies. Our rag doll-sucette again provides the key and obliges us to link up the whole series *guenon*, *gueniche*, *guenille*, *guenappe*, etc., with the Germanic word 'to wean,' Dutch *wenen*. *Guenon* is really a \**sevron* first of all, then a 'doll,' and then only a 'monkey' (cp. Gascon *mounaque*: *poupée* plutôt informe, faite de chiffons réunis au petit bon-

heur; doigtier de chiffon pour couvrir une blessure, femme laide et mal fagotée; personne à figure renfrognée. Palay, *Dictionnaire du Béarnais et du Gascon modernes*) and the various other meanings shared by the members of the family, 'rags,' 'prostitute,' 'old woman,' etc., can all be matched among the other words for 'doll' scattered here and there over the 'bambola' and 'poupée' maps

'Accendo la pipa' (760).

Another map from which etymologies, new and old, fall like ripe fruit. The literary form for the verb is practically confined to the Tuscan area. The remainder of the peninsula displays a more or less solid mass of *appicciare* forms in the south, and a welter of competing forms in the north with a widespread predominance of a form *impicciare* in some very curious guises. One of the oddest competitors of this northern word is a derivative of *viscus*, *viscare*, originally 'to stick'; cp the 'glu' map of the *ALF* (1830), where *visk* for 'bird-lime' is common on the adjoining Provençal area. This immediately reminds us that *appicciare* also means 'to stick,' or rather 'to stick together *in pairs*' and forthwith we are confronted with an interesting semasiological and etymological problem: what is the relationship between the ideas 'to stick' and 'to light,' and what connection, if any, is there between the root words of *viscare* and *appicciare*?

With the last map reviewed we were in the nursery. Here we are in the nursery garden. In the former the child's 'dummy' gave us the connecting link between a number of apparently heterogeneous words. Here the link is provided by methods of tree- and plant-grafting. Whether German *anstecken*, which means 'to fasten,' 'to set light to' and 'to catch' (of a disease), has the same fundamental basis I shall not here discuss. I cite it at present merely to parallel the semantic relationship, a relationship which we shall more readily understand if we forget our modern match-box and call to mind more primitive methods of transferring or transmitting fire. These methods form essentially a 'grafting' process, and that is why on the French map 'allumer' (*ALF* 34) we find the verb *āpar*, at pt. 73, which occurs as *āpa* at pt. 57 of the 'greffer' map (*ALF* 666), and why on the map 'exalter' (*ALF* 1821) the form *āpeto* occurs at pt. 913 not very far from the central southern domain of *emputa* 'greffer.' Of these words more anon.

To 'graft' is the connecting link between southern *appicciare* and north-western *viscare*. Is their relationship any closer than that? In the process of grafting there is first a joining of the two members (cp. *ALF* 666, pts. 944, 946, 947: *jointar* 'to graft') and then a smearing or covering of the joint. For this purpose, the *Vinti Giornate dell' Agricoltura* by Agostino Gallo (Venise, 1615) recommends, p. 104, that the 'tronco... sia ben legato e ben coperto colla cera composta col largato [...] per esser migliore dell' altra nel coprire, e nell' empire ogni fessura, e perche ancor' è di manca spesa.' And though it is true that 'cera' is not 'pece,' the map 'la resina' (568) shows them both used as a name for 'resin' (cp. Engl. cobbler's wax—'pitch'), we are therefore obliged to conclude that *pece* is at the base of *appicciare*, just as *visc* 'lime' is obviously at the base of *viscare*. But if *pece* is the root of *appicciare*, it is also the root of *impicciare*, and Diez was right in his derivation of Italian *impicciare*, 'to embarrass,' despite Meyer-Lubke's rejection of an etymology strongly backed up on the semantic side by two other 'pitch' derivatives, Spanish *pegar* and popular Italian *impegolare*<sup>1</sup>.

This *impicciare*, found in the north for 'accendere,' has another competitor with which it is often entangled or blended. The following are a few forms of it (1st pers. pres. md.): *amvet* (pt. 5), *vid* (9), *ympi* (319), *impyyo* (362). The Greek *ἐμψυρεύειν*, on which *imputare*, the base of French *enter* and Prov. *emputar* 'to graft,' has been modelled, will not satisfy all these forms, any more than it completely accounts for O.E. *imþian* and O.H.G. *imþfon*, which is found beside a more obvious representation, *imþfiton*. We must not be blinded by the dogma of speech uniformity in the Vulgar

<sup>1</sup> Just as, despite Gamillscheg and Bloch, Latré was right in seeing *poiz* in *empois*, cp the forms *empays*, etc., for *pece* in Piemonte (*AIS* 210), and *embesk* for *besk* (*viscum*), at pts. 727 and 728, for 'bird-lime,' on *ALF* 1830. In both cases we have throw-offs from a verb-form with prefix *im-*. The probable entanglements of *impedicare* and *impicciare* in France call for further investigation. The form of *empeser* precludes a direct descent from the latter; it has apparently been reconstructed from *empois*.

Latin period to the extent of believing, either that every Greek word borrowed was latinised in a completely uniform manner throughout the Romania, or that when Greek possessed two alternative forms only one of these could penetrate into the domain of Latin. We must remember that Greek and Latin met on an extended front and in a multitude of social contacts, high and low. We can only visualise the linguistic past in terms of the linguistic present. And in many cases of Greek borrowings a similar variety of pronunciations must have prevailed in Italy as in present-day France for such English words as *beef-steak* and *meeting*.

The  $\phi$  of Greek  $\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$ , for example, could be latinised as *p* or *f*. Spanish *pua*, 'a shoot' or 'scion,' is a husbandry word and in my view represents  $\phi\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  or  $\phi\upsilon\eta$ . And there were good reasons, no doubt, for *p* to be preferred, as  $\phi\upsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$  corresponds with *futuere*. But all regions may not have been so susceptible, and a form with *f* instead of *p* satisfies such forms as *amvrd* in the Rhetian area perfectly.<sup>1</sup> Now Greek has  $\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$  beside  $\epsilon\mu\phi\upsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$ . It seems clear that the shorter form has been borrowed as well and latinised variously as *impuare*, *impyare*, *imfyare*, or, with voicing of the *f*, *invyare*. The former has spread to O H G. and to O E as *impfon* and *impran*. As *impare* (cp. *quattuor* > *quattor*) it accounts for the *ampar* forms found in eastern French areas. As *invyare* it accounts admirably for French *enger* (> *engeance*) and O F *aengier*, which in sense value is equal to what a German *\*animpfen* would be. To derive *aengier* from *adimplicare*, as does the *EW F* seems quite erroneous. According to the examples in Tobler-Lommatsch, 'evil' can 'aengier,' one can *aengier* 'God in oneself,' one can be *aengré* with 'all good,' with 'death,' with 'vermin' and with 'error' (cp. the metaphorical uses of German *propfen* and *impfen*). As for *enger*, a glance at Littré's examples convinces of the appropriateness of the idea of 'to graft' or 'inoculate' as a basis for all its usages, particularly for that quoted in the *Supplément*. Partout leurs demandes de révoltés estoient pareilles; dont les Suaubes estoient premiers auteurs, et en avoyent engé les autres.

The ramifications of this map, as we have already seen, take us into Spain. But in addition to *pegar*, which among its multitude of meanings includes that of 'to catch,' of a disease or a fire, but which, nowadays at all events, does not mean 'to graft,' we are led to consider the verb *ingertar* with a *g* which awakes attention. I would suggest that this is a loan word from France, adopted possibly owing to the semantic overload of *pegar*, and that it is a blending of a northern *enger* with its southern rival *insertar*, in other words, that both available words were borrowed and that the resulting *ingertar* is a compromise between them, similar to those which are visible to-day in Italy between *impuar* and *impicciare*, if indeed the latter is itself not a blending of *impiare* and *appiccare*.

To make anything approaching a complete study of this map we must await the publication of the map for 'innestare.' I would venture to predict, however, even at this stage, that of this word and its equivalent *annestare*, the latter, as representing another of the fundamental stages of grafting, that of 'binding together,' will show itself to be the primitive form, as indeed it more aptly describes the most elementary method of grafting, that of merely juxtaposing the two members, and that it will reveal itself as a derivative of *necto*, *nexus* > *annexitare*.

'(Bestemmiare) come un turco' (811)

The map '(to swear) like a trooper' brings us out of the domain of 'Wörter und Sachen' into a field where the 'idealistischer Philolog' would be more at home. Can we, by an examination of the variants for 'come un turco' and 'comme un païen' which this map and *ALF* 982 supply, discover any manifestation of a difference of mentality or outlook in the two neighbouring 'Latin' peoples?

Naturally, on both maps, the Turk and the pagan are in the majority, because in both cases the question put by the investigator contained the current comparison. But there are sufficient variants for our test, 50 on the French side as against some 35 in Italy. In both countries the Church's condemnation of blasphemy is very apparent.

<sup>1</sup> An influence of *advivare* is not impossible in the Rhetian word. *Advivare* accounts satisfactorily for the *avivar* forms found on the 'accendo' and the 'allumer' maps; cp. *vivacem* > *viaz*.

In Italy the 'dannato' provides the comparison at 15 points, in France the 'damné' at 17 points, with a variant, 'perdu,' at 5 points. In both countries one can swear like 'a devil,' or, more rarely, 'the devil' (Italy 30, France 12), or 'a demon' (Italy 9, France 2), a similarly 'inspired' comparison, no doubt, in both cases, but with Italy well in the lead.

When we come to the next set of religious parallels, allusions to paganism and heresy, if we neglect the current 'Turk' and 'pagan,' France is nowhere against Italy's (he swears) like 'a heretic' (20 times), like 'a pagan' (4), 'an Aryan' (3), 'a Lutheran' (1), 'an African' (1), 'a Sarrasin' (1), 'a Jew' (12), 'a Hebrew' (7), 'a circumcised' (3), 'a renegade' (3), France can offer nothing but 2 Jews (both near the Spanish frontier), 1 'renegade,' with an amusing popular variant 'revenant,' and the more intellectual variants 'an atheist' (1), 'an apostate' (1), and a 'débaptisé' (1). It is true that France has also 4 'Huguenots,' but these, like the 'Bourguignons' so numerous in the north-west (9) and the solitary 'Picard' in the Creuse department, are historical relics which go back to famous disturbers of the peace and have no 'sectarian' basis, any more than the widespread 'comme un templier' (21) found in the north-east; cp current French 'boire comme un templier'.

Another set in which Italy is quite 'hors concours' also displays the reprobation meted out by the Church to the swearer, and places the latter right outside the pale of humanity. At one point in Italy you can swear like 'an ogre,' at 21 like 'a beast,' at 11 like 'an animal,' like 'a dog' at 7, 'a pig' at 5, 'a bear' at 3, 'an ass' at 3, 'a wolf' at 1, and, sad to relate, at one also like 'an ox'! No priest could impose such smiles on the French mind or tongue, and so, save for a lonely and not very intelligible 'comme une rosse' on the far north-eastern frontier, this group is entirely absent from the French map.

But Italy loses all her lead in the next group, which we may call 'vocational.' The soldier's excellence in the art of profanity is inadequately recognised in both countries; in addition to the Burgundians, Picards and Huguenots just mentioned, France brings in the 'trooper' and the 'dagoon' once only, and Italy once only the 'conscript.' But France pays handsome recognition to the drover and his lash ('charretier,' 'vorturier,' 'roulier,' 28 points in all) and Italy, though only in the neighbourhood of the French zone of influence, mentions him nine times. France also displays her keener sense of economic and social values with her 'portefaix' (4), 'crocheteur' (1), 'ragman' (3), 'tinker' (3), 'water-carrier' (1), 'paysan' (probably a variant of 'païen,' 1), 'pauvre' (5), 'malheureux' (1); Italy, where poverty is no disgrace, inflicts no such discredit upon her down-and-outs, save for one solitary 'ragman' and a rather mysterious 'borveda' which M. Jud understands as 'eimer der Pulver herstellt.' More socially justifiable perhaps is the slightly greater severity which, compared with Italy, France displays with her 'comme un débauché' (1), her 'thief' (3), her 'brigand' (1), her 'galérien' (1) and her 'scélérat' (1), a group to which Italy only contributes one 'scelerato' and one 'assassino.' But where Italy is left completely standing is in the next two groups. France, as we have seen, will not admit that profanity sets a man among the brute beasts. For her it is a human failing, and, while condemning the lack of 'mesure' and 'raison' it denotes, she accounts for it by some pathological condition, physical or mental, in the delinquent, and so, against her 'écorché' (2), 'possédé' (7), 'fou' (3), 'enragé' (1), 'retourneur de boudins' (1), 'casseur d'assiettes' (10), 'brûleur de maisons' (1), 'sauvage' (1), Italy can only set one solitary 'selvatico.'

But France is the country not only of Descartes but of Voltaire, and only in France could one be expected to swear like 'a curé' (2), 'a priest' (13), 'a père' (1), 'a bishop' (1) or 'a pope' (1)! It is true that Italy appears to have been inoculated with the same satirical spirit, for at point 760 they swear like 'a saint'; but no, at point 760 the dialect basis is not Italian, it is Franco-Provençal! To sum up: In Italy, a submissive catholicism, a less developed critical sense, a humbler economic status; in France, a bourgeois outlook, a resentment against the disturber of the peace, a deprecation of conduct not based upon reason and restraint, and a touch of anti-clericalism and satire, national characteristics which even a linguistic atlas clearly reveals.

JOHN ORR.

*Historia de la Literatura Nacional Española en la Edad de Oro.* Por LUDWIG PFANDL Traducción del alemán por el Dr Jorge Rubió Balaguer. Barcelona. Juan Gili 1933. xv+692 pp. 28 pesetas.

Dr Pfandl's *Geschichte der spanischen Nationalliteratur in ihrer Blütezeit* was mentioned in the bibliography of this periodical for July, 1929, but it does not appear that review copies reached this country. The present Spanish rendering, therefore, may be reviewed as though it were an original. It is the work of a highly accomplished Catalan scholar, and its accuracy is above the standard normal in that country. The bibliographical entries have been revised, but incompletely. The reader should consider them reliable up to 1928, when the German text was concluded.

Ticknor's history of Spanish literature was in three volumes, but the phenomenal success of the late Professor Fitzmaurice-Kelly's work reduced the scale from three to one. One-volume accounts (handy for, and often frankly addressed to, university classes of a pass standard) are now abundant. They are inventories rather than works of criticism, and a gap lies between them and the scholarly monographs on many subjects, in the sense that we feel the want of general works on an ampler plan, capable of treating whole periods in a manner detailed enough to serve the experienced reader. Cejador's fifteen volumes, of course, are incapable of this service, even if we were able to trust any single one of his affirmations. The present book appears, indeed, in one tome only; but it covers little more than a century and takes more paper than three ordinary manuals. Dr Pfandl has, therefore, room to discuss general topics, and to bring the vast and irregular mass of Golden Age literature under the control of certain leading ideas. And yet there are many passages in which he is scarcely more expansive than the text-books. In such matters as Mysticism and the Drama, when he has discussed general topics, he offers no more than selected authors or works by way of illustration, and there are other aspects of Golden Age literature (such as History and the Epic) which he does not care to develop. The reader will discover, therefore, that the scale of treatment is not uniform. This is not a manual, even for the scholar. It is an entirely personal treatment of an epoch of Spanish literature, carried out with astonishing industry and width of learning, and with quite personal limits of sympathy. This point is realised by its author in several passages (e.g., pp. 322, 420, 500), in which he puts forward views not as generally received nor as absolutely true, but as his opinion.

His most important service is to bring Golden Age literature under the control of leading critical ideas. Fundamental among these is the effort to relate literature to the social and intellectual background of that age. Thus the order of narrative is not chronological, nor is the author scrupulous to interpret the personality of writers. Even so great a figure as Cervantes is distributed among different chapters, and his dramas and *Galatea* are removed to a distance of half a century from his other efforts. The great social fact of the age was the nationhood of Spain, its literature is a 'Nationalliteratur.' The author excludes from his purview Catalans and Portuguese, whose work is irrelevant to this



centralised literature. He excludes also Mexicans and Chileans, I think with less reason. For by what token is any writer of that age given any other nationality than Spanish? Was it not a characteristic of the nationhood of Spain that on it the sun never set? The reader must be prepared, however, to hear of Balbuena's *Bernardo* but not his *Grandeza Mexicana*, of Ercilla (and that rather briefly) but not Oña or Castellanos, of Hojeda but not Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, and he must expect disappointment as he reads the notice of Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca. He cannot complain, however, but only regret that so well-documented a writer thought fit to treat these names as beyond his sphere of interest. This *Blutezent*, Dr Pfandl holds, extends from 1555 to about 1700 (but really not much past 1659 as a period of efflorescence). The limits are disconcerting at times. There is no Garcilaso de la Vega Montemayor, *Abundarráez*, *Lazarillo*, etc., are wanting, though there are chapters devoted to their copies or congeners. Within these dates, thus somewhat arbitrarily enforced, there lies a century of literary effort governed, for Dr Pfandl, by two main tendencies: Mysticism and the Baroque. His book is divided into two periods, and each half is opened by an essay on one of these themes. That on Mysticism seems to me admirable, particularly in the knowledge imparted to us of its theological background. The notion of the Baroque, dear to German criticism of recent years, is one which I am still unable to assimilate.

So Spanish Literature of the Golden Age is another case of 'Stromungen.' As applied to German literature of the last fifty years, this method diminishes the importance of the artist's personality, and also shows considerable complexity of detail. Writers 'stream' in different directions from each other, from themselves at an earlier date, or from themselves simultaneously. Is it merely because Spain is distant and the Golden Age remote that two 'streams' alone are discerned in a hundred years? Is it always, for instance, relevant to calculate where each author between 1555 and 1600 stands with regard to Mysticism or even Platonism? Herrera, León and S. Juan de la Cruz are ordered on p. 161 according to the state of their souls. 'mundana, místico-mundana o completamente mística.' Judgments as to states of grace or morals tend to take the place of literary appreciation; analyses of content replace criticism. Normally this insistence on thoughts rather than style is instructive and stimulating, but there are certainly cases in which pure stylists suffer, and even important thinkers are liable to be cold-shouldered when they do not illustrate one or other 'Stromung.'

There is no room here to embark on any general discussion, and I must confine myself to a list of points. Note the treatment of Cano and Suárez among Salamanca philosophers in the first chapter. Dr Pfandl accepts *Del conocimiento de sí mismo* as by León, and points to Teresian influence in it. That would indicate the date 1582, which I have proposed on other grounds. León's scholarship is not separable from his poems (as Dr Pfandl avers on p. 189) as practically all the chapter 'Pastor' of the *Nombres de Cristo* is repeated in lyrics, poetry is defended and Psalm-renderings begin in 'Monte,' and the Platonic heaven appears in *Nombres de Cristo*.

and *Job*. On the other hand there are poems wholly Horatian or epically Vergilian which have nothing to do with these prose writings because they belong to the period before 1572. Thus dating is essential to understand León's lyrics, one should not generalise the Platonic mood too much. The conflict with León de Castro was not wholly personal (p. 184), as the rival claims of Septuagint and Hebrew are still of scholarly importance in dubious readings, and were then much more difficult to assess. The *Nombres de Cristo* aims at more than *vulgarización*. It is a serious use of the vernacular, deeply technical in the chapter 'Jesús,' and claims to be a contribution to restoring the unity of Christendom on the basis of an enlightened Catholicism, with arguments for certain dogmas then rebutted, and against Jews and Lutherans. Herrera's Lepanto and Alcazarquivir odes are not merely indebted to the Bible. They are made up of blocks of Scripture (Psalms, Isaiah, Song of Moses, etc.), and Herrera's attitude is that of a prophet of wrath. Hence their difference from all his other poems, even the other heroic odes. The ring of the sentences is that of the Vulgate, and not, in the strictest sense, Hebraic. Dr Pfandl neglects to develop the Renaissance concept of a pastoral Golden Age (p. 86), and calls these novels boring, which is perhaps just, but hardly sympathetic. He is hostile to Petrarca and Petrarchianism, but rightly observes that Herrera is only Petrarchan in accidentals, his thought being much simpler. It is a pity this work could not draw more on Professor Peers' *Studies of the Spanish Mystics*, as the two books are complementary. Professor Peers gives a better canon; Dr Pfandl has a better theological background. All his judgments of Cervantes are interesting. He has a special (semi-mystical) interpretation of *Persiles* (p. 285) and of the moral intention of the *Novelas Ejemplares*. He puts Cervantes' best work in the Baroque Age as being anti-baroque (p. 321). In dealing with the drama he begins his general considerations with Faith, which connects up with one of his leading ideas, but seems to be a difficult gambit. He expresses preference for Alarcón over Tirso (p. 459), contrary to the general practice: they should both get fair play, and comparisons tend to be 'odious' between them because their merits are diametrically opposed. There are some good points made to distinguish Lope and Calderón, and they should have been established with regard to the code of honour (p. 414). They had the same general views, but Lope does not indulge in Calderón's casuistical excesses. Lope selects cases of disputed honour: whether a *labrador honrado* has 'honour' like an *hidalgo*. His villains deny this; the *labrador* asserts, and the King confirms. Calderón seeks to know what is the extreme case either of secrecy in the vengeance or guiltlessness in the victim. Very rightly Dr Pfandl says that appreciation of *autos sacramentales* is not confined to Catholics (p. 467). Present-day Catholic sentiment is quite unlike the theocratic national sentiment of such playlets, though Catholics may appreciate certain dogmatic elements better. As literature and culture they belong to a certain environment, and make a demand on imagination that is wholly historic. He also marks off these spectacles—rightly, I think—from the *comedias*. Their presenta-

tion being wholly different—spectacular, processional, notional—their criticism must also be different, probability, rhetoric, characterisation, etc., cannot but be different things in the *autos* from what they are in *comedias* which are conceived of as human happenings, and performed as lay entertainments. Dr Pfandl handles the *autos* with exceptional felicity. Of Góngora he remarks neatly (p. 530) that he has ‘más fama que grandeza,’ and notes the special attitude of the *Soledades* to nature. Sr Alonso described this element in them under the unpleasant rubric of ‘contenido polimórfico.’ Dr Pfandl speaks of a ‘serie de impresiones incoherentes de la naturaleza’ (p. 530). Personally, I prefer to call them ‘dissolving views’ of nature, states of æsthetic sensibility, leading on to the treatment of nature as a succession of states of the soul in the *Prelude*. In any case, it seems clear that in the *Soledades* the story and characters matter nothing, and are no more than a pretext for the poet’s impressions of nature, which constitute the true theme. Also, there is an element of insuccess in Góngora’s enterprise, which caused it to remain unfinished. The treatment of Gracián seems to me very interesting, as also the comparison on p. 604 of Cervantes, Quevedo and Gracián, as representatives of the age.

These are a few impressions, and any other student could find as long a list of stimulating novelties. They bear witness to the value and interest of Dr Pfandl’s personal contribution to our enjoyment of the best Spanish literature.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

*Obras de D. RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL* Vol. I: *La Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara*. Vol. II: *Historia y Epopeya*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos. 1934. xvi + 490 and 308 pp. 22 and 15 ptas.

The commencement of an edition of Sr Menéndez Pidal’s complete works is an occasion to be marked with white chalk. His activity has been so fruitful and manifold, has lasted long enough to go out of print though never out of demand, and has been scattered in reviews and Festschriften over three continents. The second of these volumes gathers up some of these *disjecta*, the legends of Garci-Hernández and García, counts of Castile, of the Abbot of Montemayor, a new account of the capture of Toledo from Ibn Bassâm, and an interpretation of *Mainet* as a legend of specifically Toledan origin. The former volume reprints photographically his famous work on the Infantes de Lara. The author admits that it does not represent his final views in every paragraph, and he adds appendices correcting and amplifying his work in a way no other scholar could have done; but he pleads a natural disinclination to do again work that is, for the most part, definitive. Among specific changes, it appears that his celebrated reconstruction in verse of the scene of the heads would be less markedly octosyllabic; there are emendations in the account of the chronicles; and various other novel observations in the appendices, such as mention of a Tagalo version of this Legend, and confutation of Bous-sagol’s argument which denied the influence of Hookham Frere on Rivas’

*Moro Expósito* One great advantage is possessed by the policy of making a photographic reproduction. The Legend of the Infantes was written when the author was twenty-five and it has, along with its precocious maturity, a certain youthful freshness which makes it especially delightful, and it represents a feasible achievement for a young scholar. It is a book of encouragement for those who seek to learn how to become hispanists. A second advantage is that its appearance in 1896 opened an era. From 1876 to 1896 it had been the part of Menéndez y Pelayo to show that Spanish literature was no mere Romantic toy, but took its part in all the great intellectual movements of mankind, and specifically of Europe, such as the movement of Indian moral fables, the growth of the novel or the theatre, the chivalrous epos, etc. The date 1896 took the master still in mid-career, and he continued his beneficent apostolate for almost another score of years, but none the less, 1896 marked a new attitude to the subject. Sr Menéndez Pidal took for granted the achievements of his predecessor; he could assume the enthusiasm of educated minds for Spanish letters without ranging irrelevantly over the literatures of Europe. He first put Spanish works under the microscope, and showed that the business of scholarship was not with panoramas alone, but also with details, though in the pursuit of detailed truths he never lost the sense of vaster movements. In this way, the study of seven chapters of the First General Chronicle, or twelve of the Second, not merely brought to light a buried epos of poignantly tragic emphasis and illustrated its historical milieu, but it also contained by implication all this great scholar's subsequent work: the classification of the General Chronicles, the attitude adopted to epic and ballad theory, the classification and origins of ballads, the editorial methods used in the *Primera Crónica General*, etc. Particularly, it exemplified and perfected the new technique of Spanish scholarship, which has sometimes been described as German, but to me seems rather that of the École des Chartes, namely, the concentration of an immense battery of learning upon significant facts until they reveal their last shred of meaning. A rewritten *Leyenda* would have been welcome; but an accessible copy of 1896 is perhaps yet more welcome, since there lies the germ of Sr Menéndez Pidal's whole future development.

In issuing these volumes, their distinguished author has thought chiefly of the opposition manifested abroad to some of his characteristic doctrines. He offers to show that the Spanish epics are no mere fables, but spring directly from the events they relate, first as 'poetic history,' and then in the process of time, by the addition of romantic elements, developing into 'historical poetry.' The new material he has gathered in support of this contention is remarkably strong and convincing. The monastic theories of M. Bédier wear, in comparison, an air of paradox. To discover clerical interests as the main purpose of poems purely chivalrous for thousands of lines is surely to pit the part against the evidence of the whole. In Spain, at least, there is nothing to prove that monasteries, sepulchres or pilgrimage routes formed the *cantares de gesta*, though there are abundant signs of their interest *ex post facto* in keeping up the tombs of heroes and preserving their epic memories.

Space requires me to limit my comment, and therefore I shall mention only the new evidence as to the Infantes. From Ibn Hayyân (a complete edition of whose fragments is a dire necessity of Spanish mediæval scholarship) Sr Menéndez Pidal has unearthed some very curious facts concerning the years 973-5. It was an epoch of embassies to Córdoba (966-75), in which Christian chiefs quarrelled before the Caliph and the *hajib* 'Alī ibn 'Amr, later Al-Manṣūr. Almanzor had not yet become noted on the Frontier (from 977), where Ghâlib (d. 981) covered the middle frontier from his *place-d'armes* at Medina Celi. Torrambril on the Novierca, which falls into the Arabiana near Almenar, was an outpost garrisoned by five sons of a certain Amrīl ben Timlet (Sr Menéndez Pidal's spelling), who died in 972. Various embassies at Córdoba included one from the Galician Count Rodrigo Velázquez (September 23, 973), and one from Garci-Hernández of Castile (August, 974). Trouble with the Idrisids caused Ghâlib to cross to Africa, and tempted Garci-Hernández to combine with León and Navarre for the capture of Deza (September 2, 974), news of which reached Córdoba on September 12. His envoys were ordered to leave at once, and when they protested, they were imprisoned, and not further noticed by the Arabic historian. Among the events of the campaign was an ambuscade in which two of Amrīl's sons were taken, and one died. In 975 Córdoba reacted: Ghâlib inflicted an irreparable defeat on the Castilians at San Estéban de Gormaz, Almanzor arrived on the Frontier in 977, and the era of peaceful negotiations was at an end. In this story we recognise the facts of the Infantes de Lara—a raid occurring simultaneously with an embassy at Córdoba; Almanzor at Córdoba, Galve with the armies; Ruy Velázquez hostile to Castile (as a Leonese stalwart) and communicating with Almanzor; a skirmish on the Arabiana near Almenar; the capture and death of young men; a message reaching Córdoba on the *vispera de San Cebrián* (September 13), and a complexion of affairs scarcely to be imagined after 975.

These are astonishing coincidences, but there exist also differences, and discussion is likely to centre on their treatment. Sr Menéndez Pidal holds that such differences would disappear if we were possessed of full knowledge; and in fact the gap between the Legend and History is now much narrower than in 1896. Others would argue that some differences always were there, and that the student's business is to account for similarity and difference in one single exposition. Two gaps are hypothetically filled by Sr Menéndez Pidal which are vital to this identification. Gonzalo Gustioz, a perfectly historical figure, *may* have been one of Garci-Hernández's ambassadors, and he *may* have been, among them, Rodrigo Velázquez's special correspondent, also, the disaster to the Infantes *must* have been an unlucky chance in the happy campaign against Deza. But neither of these things do we know. We look for seven Castilians, we get five Moors; we look for a Castilian Ruy Velázquez, we get a Galician, we seek an enemy to Gonzalo Gustioz but one high in Garci-Hernández's favour, we get an enemy to Garci-Hernández who has no known connexion with Gonzalo Gustioz. Doña Lambra remains unexplained, and perhaps inexplicable, and the vengeance of Mudarra is unhistoric and

written off as no part of the original epos. It is possible that perfect knowledge would remove some of these difficulties, but it is also possible that the not-proven and the fictitious were always present in this story, as they were in the epos of the Cid. (The discrepancies in the Legend of Garci-Hernández and Argentina are ingeniously tackled by Sr Menéndez Pidal, who admits that it constitutes his least satisfactory case; but I doubt whether he has succeeded in explaining them away.) No one can reasonably hold that these traditional epics were *mere* fabling: the late W. P. Ker remarked justly that a kernel of truth is in all that remain alive. But likewise, I think it is pushing proof too rigidly to attempt to exclude all fiction from their original composition, particularly as it is in the fictitious and the romantic that their poetical appeal so often lies. It is not that the Cid captured Valencia which makes poetry of his life, but that his daughters were scourged in the Robledo de Corpes (which we do not know), and that he avenged himself in full Court on his foes (which is contrary to fact).

I offer these reservations with no intention to cavil. It would be a poor study where no variation of opinion existed. But in conclusion, I would turn again to Sr Menéndez Pidal's main thesis, and to urge all who deal with the traditional epos, in Germany and France or in Greece as well as in Spain, to learn from this work how remarkably coherent and living is the historical method of interpretation.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

*Notkers des Deutschen Werke*, neu herausgegeben von E. H. SEHRT und TAYLOR STARK. (*Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, 32, 33, 34.) Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1933. I, 1. xx+136 pp. 3 M. 40. I, 2 137-244 pp. 3 M. 60. 1934. I, 3. 245-403 pp. 4 M.

The editors intend reissuing the whole of Notker's works and the first three volumes bring the five books of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*.

A short Introduction, pp. v-xx, deals with the MSS., their relation, the text and the sources. Since this is presumably a definitive edition a bibliography would have been useful. As it is, work on the subject is only quoted when a mention arises out of the Introduction and some further work is cited in the textual notes. The editors state that the chief MS. consists of 136 parchment folds and when they mention those that have not been written on they employ the accepted system of referring to them by consecutively numbered folios using *a* and *b* for the pages. But then they suddenly begin to talk of 'pages' and in the text the numbering is also by 'pages,' a confusing and new usage. Has this system crept in as the editors worked from photographs?

A simpler view of orthographic inconsistencies is advanced than that favoured by Ochs (*P.B.B.* xxxviii, pp. 354 ff.), who argued that in the course of writing his works Notker repeatedly changed his system so that three different systems can be traced. Using as a basis for further argument the psalm-fragments published by Zwierzina (*P.B.B.* xlv,

pp. 192 ff), which do not fit into any of the three systems, the editors come to the conclusion that the inconsistencies are due to scribes and that originally the well-known orthographic system of Notker held good for all his works. They are forced to qualify this simple solution by presuming that some errors 'mogen auch z.T. schon, natürlich fehlerhaft, im Urtext gestanden haben.' But there is surely a difference between 'wrong' spelling and 'feasible' spelling. If there were 'feasible' spellings in the original it must mean, ultimately, that Notker was not at all times sure of his system, and the moment this is admitted we are back at the old problem.

The text is, on the whole, conservative. The Latin has now and then been corrected where it does not tally with the German; emendations proposed by Piper and Naumann have for the most part been admitted to the text. The accentual system of the MSS. has also been preserved conservatively though a good deal of correction has sometimes been resorted to based on the conclusions drawn from a dictionary prepared by the editors and the research of former workers in the same field. On pp. ix-xvi we are given a useful summary of the cases in which accents occur. In the main the editors' exposition of the system follows well-known lines. One minor exception: Fleischer has stated that the definite article has an accent when it refers to a following relative clause 'with a few exceptions in which the German relative clause does not correspond to a relative clause in the Latin original.' The editors have found many exceptions to this rule and state cautiously that the difference depends on whether the relative clause is essential or inessential. The examples given in support of this difficult rule are not convincing, and even then there are apparently exceptions.

The treatment of *b*, *d*, *g* and *p*, *t*, *k* initially differs somewhat from that deduced by Weinberg and Ochs. It will not be possible to judge the editors' work in this respect until they have published their carefully documented dictionary.

The editors seem to have solved the meaning of the puzzling sign — which Steinmeyer took to be a semi-colon, Piper as either exclamation-mark or semi-colon. It occurs about two hundred times, and is said by the editors to be a correction indicating that the stop was to be placed lower. It is a reasonable explanation, since the position of the stop is important in Notker's system, middle stop being followed by a capital letter, low stop by a small letter. The editors are able to point to a passage where this slanting line of correction was eradicated since it had been placed wrongly, also to question-marks which had been written instead of stops. Here the line of correction is placed under the stop.

The sources are dealt with in ten lines at the end of the Introduction. Naumann's conclusions have been accepted 'ohne weiteres' and *in toto*.

The texts are well set up and the addenda which appear at the end of part 1 and part 3 are not too considerable when one remembers the typographical difficulties that are raised by an edition of Notker.

The editions of Hattemer and Graff are antiquated and unobtainable, that of Piper is none too accurate, and it is a great step forward and will

lead to more intensive study of Notker that we now have a good and reliable edition on the way. May the other works and especially the dictionary follow soon!

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

*Maren von dem Stricker.* Herausgegeben von GUSTAV ROSENHAGEN  
(*Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, 35.) Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1934. xi + 98 pp.  
2 M. 40

Almost a hundred years have gone by since K. A. Hahn published his small collection of *Kleinere Gedichte von dem Stricker* (Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1839), containing thirteen poems which it was possible even at that time to attribute definitely to this poet. Since then, however, although many learned scholars have made extensive studies in regard to the Stricker and his shorter poems and although most of these have been printed in various collections and journals, there has been no further successful attempt at publishing a volume of the Stricker's poems. We must then be grateful for the appearance of this book and sincerely hope that it is merely a beginning and that it will soon be followed by other volumes in the same series, presenting his 'bîspel,' or parables, his animal fables and his other didactic poems.

In the introduction Rosenhagen explains that he is confining himself, in this volume, to the Stricker's 'Maren,' that is to those poems in which the narrative is the important feature and the moral teaching is only expressed in the few short lines of the conclusion. The collection contains thirteen 'Maren,' all of which, with the exception of No. 12 (published by Pfeiffer, *Z.f.d.A.* VII, pp. 405-9), are to be found in von der Hagen's collection of *Gesammtabenteuer* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1850), although Hagen only definitely attributed a few of them to the Stricker. Two of these, No. 5, 'Die Wette' and No. 13, 'Der durstige Einsiedel,' receive new titles, being formerly named 'Scheidung und Suhne' and 'Der Weltheilige' respectively. It is rather surprising to find that neither the poem 'Von einem ubelen wibe' (published by Brietzmann, *Die Böse Frau*, Berlin, 1912, pp. 1-14) nor 'Der Richter und der Teufel' (*G.A.*, No. 69) has found a place in this collection, for both would come under Rosenhagen's definition of 'Mare,' and according to Zwierzina's manuscript commentary and bibliography, which Rosenhagen quotes with such praise, there is no doubt that they are poems by the Stricker.

The introduction gives furthermore a brief description of the four most important manuscripts in which the poems are found, and an appreciation of the poet, which, in spite of the brevity necessitated by the very character of the *Altdeutsche Textbibliothek*, may without hesitation be termed excellent. A few words might, however, have been said about the person of the poet; in dealing with the MSS. Rosenhagen mentions that the Stricker was long considered to be an Austrian, but does not go on to explain that he is now considered to be a South Franconian, or to give a brief survey of the other conjectures made about his life.



The text, which attempts to present a speech-form such as would have been in general use in the early thirteenth century for the recitation of these 'Maren,' is on the whole a great advance on the texts of von der Hagen, although a few printer's errors occur (e.g., No 11, line 19, for 'dar in' read 'under in'). The critical apparatus on the other hand can by no means be so highly praised, in addition to obvious slips (e.g., p 81, for 157, 163 and the second 155 read respectively 158, 164 and 156), there are many which are not so apparent. On p 10 for example the apparatus reads '76 = A, noch dehein w H,' but the text gives for line 76, 'denne ie noch dehein wip', this would seem to be a clumsy way of saying that 'denne ie' are missing in H, but a comparison with Hagen's text shows that the reading in H is *dannoch ie dehein wip*, which would seem to show that the apparatus here is not only clumsy but also inaccurate. In some parts of the book, at least, one such inaccuracy may be found on every page.

A further shortcoming of the apparatus is that it uses abbreviated references which have not been explained in the introduction or elsewhere. Naturally a certain acquaintance with the Stricker's minor poems and the literature which deals with them is enough to explain for instance that K (p 87) stands for the Kalocza copy of the manuscript H, and that 'Hahn' (p. 66) stands for the above-mentioned edition of the Stricker's poems, but it is not in the tradition of the *Alldeutsche Textbibliothek* to take such an acquaintance for granted. It is a pity that careful work and preparation extending over a number of years should be somewhat impaired by an impression of a certain haste in publication.

CLAIR BAIER.

LIVERPOOL.

*The Popular Background to Goethe's Hellenism.* By H. TREVELYAN. London: Longmans, Green. 1934. xii+108 pp. 7s. 6d.

*Goethe Centenary Papers read in observance of the one-hundredth anniversary of Goethe's Death at the University of Chicago.* Ed. by MARTIN SCHUTZE. Chicago and London: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1933. \$1.75.

If Mr Trevelyan had been content to abide by the subject of his thesis to present the state of Greek studies in Germany at the time of Goethe's youth, he might have written a book which, though it could not hope to vie with the ripe scholarship of the late Marshall Montgomery's investigations into the same subject, would yet have afforded a useful background against which to set Goethe's own classical achievements. But unfortunately Mr Trevelyan constantly (and deliberately it would seem) confuses two distinct issues. the general state of Greek studies, and Goethe's own particular knowledge of them. Having shown that the German conception of Hellenism when Goethe was a boy was both distorted and incomplete he argues (without adducing any evidence) that Goethe was his whole life long under these false impressions of boyhood. To lend support to this thesis he deliberately rejects the influence of Winckelmann, Lessing, Herder, G. C. Heyne, on the specious ground that

it came too late to create an 'atmosphere' and so modify Goethe's boyish outlook. As though Goethe must needs have waited on the opinion of every Tom, Dick and Harry before forming his own judgment! As though he had not hailed the supreme achievement of the *Laokoon* while still a student in Leipzig and had been a devoted adherent of Winckelmann since he first heard his name from his master, Oeser! As if he had not written the enthusiastic appreciation of 1805 in *Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert*!

Had Mr Trevelyan really read the article of Robert Hering<sup>1</sup> which he misquotes in his bibliography, he would scarcely have underrated Goethe's knowledge of classical antiquity as he does. Though never a profound Greek scholar, Goethe possessed, relatively to his time, a very competent grounding in the language and its literature. That he soon advanced beyond Wieland (whom Mr Trevelyan pillories as the typical exponent of the Greek 'atmosphere' of the time) is proved by the well-known farce in which he derides Wieland's pseudo-Grecian affectations. Under Herder's influence he learned to appreciate the greatness of Homer and Pindar, until in the Wetzlar period they have become his 'only study.' He submitted his Greek scholarship to the crucial test of rendering the fifth Olympian Ode into German and achieved considerable success. He was sufficiently familiar with Plato to point out each deviation of Mendelssohn's *Phaedo* from the original, and his early poetry shows at least a bowing acquaintance with the philosophy of Empedocles and Pythagoras. He even, before Nietzsche, had an intuition of the Dionysiac element in Greek culture, as is shown by his *Prometheus* or *Satyros*. If, later, he returned to the classical ideals of 'edle Einfalt und stille Grosse,' it was not owing to imperfect knowledge, but to the deliberate adoption of the æsthetic doctrines of the 'grand siècle.' He was always less concerned in copying the Greeks than in applying the principles he had learned from antiquity to his own art 'Jeder sei auf seine Art ein Grieche, aber er sei's!'

It is surely to exaggerate to write of the new Humanism 'withering in the mists of Romanticism' (p. 26). The Romanticists had no hostility to the Greeks. Friedrich Schlegel based his critical activity on classical literature, and his brother August Wilhelm wrote the first authoritative account of the Greek drama. Holderlin, Platen, Morike, Creutzer were all consummate Greek scholars, and even the frivolous Heine entered the lists as the champion of sensuous and joyous Hellenism against austere and ascetic Nazarenism.

Mr Trevelyan writes vividly and freshly but with youth's sweeping use of generalities. 'The general impression left by this survey may well be one of confusion rather than of clarity,' the author modestly writes in his Conclusion, and we will leave it at that!

During the War we were often reminded that 15-20 millions of Germans lived in more or less compact communities in North America. Of these some half million are to be found in Chicago, and it is no wonder

<sup>1</sup> It is not a book, as the bibliography suggests, but an article in the *Jahrb. des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts*, 1902, p. 199: 'Der Einfluss des classischen Altertumes auf den Bildungsgang des jungen Goethe.'

that Miss R. J. Seitz was able to adduce such convincing and amusing evidence of the peaceful penetration of German culture into the life and spirit of the city. And if further evidence were needed the illustration of the fine statue to young Promethean Goethe in Chicago's chief park would provide it, and remind us with shame that there is not in the whole of Great Britain (or of the British Empire as far as I know) a single public monument to the greatest of German poets<sup>1</sup>

It was particularly appropriate, then, that the University of Chicago should have issued this interesting record of its Goethe celebrations. It provokes respectful admiration for an audience, or a succession of audiences, who after partaking of two dinners and enjoying two concerts, should have found time and pleasure in listening to no fewer than twelve lectures in the brief space of two days<sup>1</sup>

It was inevitable that with so varied a team some of them should have proved restive. Professor Curme, who was allotted the task of writing on Goethe's language, grew weary after four pages and testily announced that he saw nothing peculiar in it: 'it is merely fine German!' Other contributors were, unfortunately, neither so frank nor so brief. After confessing in his preliminary remarks that he had nothing new to say, it seems a pity that the German Consul General should have taken twenty-two pages to say it! His survey of the rise of the German spirit from the earliest times to Goethe is too rambling and confused to have much value. But no doubt the editor had good reasons of his own for inserting it. Fortunately the other contributors approach their subject with greater scholarship and less ambition.

Not all these papers would claim, I suppose, to present (in the academic sense) 'an original contribution to learning.' Yet one and all are marked by competent scholarship and adequate presentation of their subjects. It is perhaps invidious to single out any one essay for commendation or criticism, where all deserve honourable mention. Professor Hagboldt is particularly interesting in his presentation from the sources of Emerson's fluctuating opinion of Goethe, until it settled into that of a Representative Man<sup>1</sup>. Professor Lovett would have found additional material for his study of Goethe in English Literature in some of the recent *Publications* of the English Goethe Society. There was little to glean in the field of 'Goethe in France' after the efficient harvesting of Messrs Baldensperger and Loiseau. 'Goethe and older German Literature,' a triple comparison of *Werther*, *La Nouvelle Héloïse* and *Iacopo Ortis*<sup>2</sup>, 'Goethe and Present Day Writers' (one misses a reference to Paul Ernst), these are some of the other subjects treated in this volume. Professor Schaub discusses Goethe's reactions to the various philosophic systems with which he came in contact, without, however, granting him the merit of a logical and consistent philosophic structure of his own. Modern German critics, we will note, tend to take Goethe seriously as an exponent of a new organo-

<sup>1</sup> He might perhaps have referred to F. A. Braun's article, 'Goethe as viewed by Emerson,' in *G.E.G.P.*, xv, 1916, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Bullock might perhaps have referred to a very early comparison between *Werther* and *Ortis* in the *Quarterly Review* of 1812, viii, p. 441. See J. M. Carré, *Bibliographie de Goethe en Angleterre*, Paris, 1920, p. 31

dynamic philosophy of life, representative of the creative spirit ruling the universe. Professor Schutze, the editor of the series, is an authority on Goethe's lyric poetry and summarises his views in the final essay in the volume. One might perhaps quarrel with some of his more general assertions that Goethe's songs and the Minnesang were equally spontaneous expressions of lyrical feeling; that the differences between 'folk-song' and 'art poetry' are merely imaginary (in which case a long series of scholars from Herder to Naumann have spilt much ink in vain!), but there is no doubt of his genuine feeling for Goethe's poetry which he rightly claims as the supreme consummation of German literature. (But if he was so intent on emphasising the passionate ecstasy of *Gretchen am Spinnrade* why did he not quote from the original version with its culminating outburst of erotic desire: 'Mein Schoos! Gott! drangt Sich nach ihm hin?')

But such slight differences of opinion imply no carping criticism of a volume which, considering the restricted circle from which it derives, is admirable in its breadth of outlook. It affords eloquent testimony that German literature is, in the University of Chicago, a living reality and not merely a dry subject of academic study.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY.

LONDON.

*The Relation of History to Drama in the Works of Friedrich Hebbel.* By PAUL G. GRAHAM. (*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, xv, 1-2.) Northampton, Mass.. Smith College. 1933-4. vi+107 pp. \$1 50

The author of this study, which was originally undertaken as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Yale University, has not been entirely successful in grappling with the main problem presented by his difficult theme. While justly protesting against a critical attitude (by no means uncommon in Germany) which lays stress on Hebbel's theory of historical drama and neglects his practice, except by way of occasional illustration, Professor Graham hardly convinces the reader that he himself has been governed by the principle which underlies his protest and has considered the dramas independently of that theory. It is true that the major part of his book consists of an examination of individual plays, in chronological order. But this investigation is preceded by an 'outline of Hebbel's theory with respect to the use of history in drama'; and, in the course of this introductory chapter, the relation of theory and practice is to a considerable extent predetermined. 'In treating Hebbel's plays it will be essential to determine to what extent they are symbolical. Looking forward to that discussion, it will be valuable to know what Hebbel in all probability would try to symbolise in his dramas. In other words, what was Hebbel's conception of life? What were the general principles of life, that were to be illustrated by the dramatic treatment of examples occurring in history? Once we have answered these questions, we shall know rather definitely what historical materials would be suitable to Hebbel, and where he would try to place the emphasis in interpreting such materials' (p. 3). 'In the problems which will be discussed with

regard to the individual dramas the element of reconciliation is not directly involved, though the question of tragic guilt will be discussed in connection with its importance as a factor in determining the selection and interpretation of historical materials' (p. 5). After summarising what he considers to be the most important features of Hebbel's theory, the author then adds that it will be necessary to determine 'whether or not they characterise each drama' (p. 8). What Hebbel wished to symbolise, he concludes, was the critical relation in life—an apt term used to describe Hebbel's conception of the individual unit in relation to the whole—'and he sought historical materials that would illustrate this principle, and then attempted to give them meaning' (pp. 11 f.). Three questions, embodying characteristics which appear most essential to Hebbel's theory, are then formulated, for application to each drama: '(1) Are the dramas set in great historical crises, revealing the critical relation of the Absolute to the individual? (2) If so, do the crises assume an evolutionary character or not? (3) Do the dramas combine a historical setting with one or more problems closely related to the setting and also of special interest to the author's own time?' (p. 12). The individual plays, from *Judith* to *Demetrius*, are then examined from these three points of view, the results of the investigation are summarised at the end of each chapter, and a short survey expresses the author's general conclusions.

The isolation of a problem such as the relation of history to drama in the work of any given poet has its dangers. One of these is the natural tendency to overrate the importance of the problem, and to assign what may be a disproportionate value to those features of the poet's work which afford evidence for the investigation. The present study is not free from this effect of disproportion. The relative importance, in such plays as *Maria Magdalena*, *Herodes und Mariamne*, or *Gyges und sein Ring*, of the 'historical crisis' on the one hand, and the poet's power of portraying tragic character on the other, is clear enough to those who read the dramas without ulterior purpose; but it is hardly suggested by the brief account of *Maria Magdalena*, which ends with the following statement: 'As the head of his family, Meister Anton held to moral principles which others about him were unwilling to accept. This is why he is such a significant and tragic figure. Here Hebbel illustrated the critical relation by treating the conflict between an individual and society. Hebbel hoped that his treatment of this contemporary social problem would aid in facilitating the development of new standards for the lower class' (p. 35), or by the summary of *Gyges und sein Ring* at the end of chapter eight. While the critic himself may be aware of many other things which are of paramount importance for an appreciation of Hebbel's dramatic achievement—and some of the incidental observations suggest such an awareness—he is prevented by his formulæ of investigation from giving them their proper value. A striking example of this occurs in the brief discussion of Hebbel's choice of a social theme in *Maria Magdalena*: 'The chief motives and explanations for Hebbel's leaving the field of historical tragedy and entering the field of modern social drama have been outlined. The fact that *Judith* and *Genoveva* had been relatively unsuccessful is of

importance. The fact that the one great plan for a historical tragedy, *Moloch*, did not seem to progress is another factor. Perhaps through a play such as *Maria Magdalena*, when he completed it, the approval of the critics could be won, and eventually they would grow more friendly toward what Hebbel considered a higher form of drama' (pp. 37 f.). Such a criticism seems to disregard not only Hebbel's own statement, in a letter to Engländer of 1863, that *Maria Magdalena* (and indeed all his dramas) sprang in the first place from an individual experience, but also the more potent argument of the play's own power and sincerity.

In a study such as this the question of priority is of major interest: did Hebbel write his dramas in accordance with his theories, or did he evolve his theories on the basis of that same experience of life which combined with temperament to make him write his tragedies? Professor Graham offers no very clear conclusion on this point. On the one hand, the chief features of Hebbel's theory of drama provide the formulæ for examination of his plays (p. 12); on the other, in the final chapter, the relation of theory and practice is thus expressed: 'Before Hebbel's first major work was begun his theories concerning historical drama were remarkably definite and complete. Yet in the course of writing plays and in reflecting upon them after completion he constantly revised his theories, with the result that they conform to a high degree to his dramas' (p. 99). And again, in the concluding paragraph of his book, the author asserts that for all the plays except *Die Nibelungen* and *Demetrius* Hebbel chose materials for reasons other than their intrinsic value, and that his dramas were, in the main, illustrations of his philosophy of life (pp. 104 f.). A different hypothesis, however, might be put forward: that where Hebbel chose historical themes, he chose them for the reason that guided him elsewhere—his paramount interest in the extraordinary individual, set in a situation which tests to the full his or her unusual quality. His theoretical views on the importance of the 'moment of historical crisis' may well be only another manifestation of this acute consciousness of the abnormal; by themselves, they surely do not suffice to account for the psychological interest of Judith or Kriemhild, the tragic grandeur of Herodes or Mariamne, the spiritual achievement of Klara or Rhodope. This volume suggests (whether intentionally or no) that the historical and philosophical background is the substance of Hebbel's major tragedies, and in this way its academic treatment of a single theme seems to involve some injustice to the poet and the dramatist.

Apart from this fundamental disadvantage in critical method and outlook, the study is a useful compilation of material from original sources.

EDNA PURDIE.

LONDON.

*Some Aspects of the Life and Work of Nietzsche particularly of his connection with Greek literature and thought.* By A. H. J. KNIGHT. Cambridge: University Press. 1933. 194 pp. 10s. 6d.

The main thesis of this book, that Nietzsche's ideas can be matched in Greek thought, especially in the thought of the Pre-Socratic philo-

sophers, and that he arrived at his ideas either under their influence or in close conjunction with his devoted study of them, is sound and convincing. It is not a new thesis Oehler argued it drily thirty years ago. But there was room for a more flexible and expansive treatment of it and Mr Knight was fully justified in attempting it. In the better parts of this volume he reinforces the argument that Dionysus, Eternal Recurrence, the Superman, and all Nietzsche's aristocratic morality have the closest affinity with one or other of Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Theognis, Pindar, Thucydides, and others. He writes here with knowledge and discernment and has more to say on this and related subjects—see his essay on 'Nietzsche and Epicurus' in *Philosophy*, October, 1933—than he lets into his book.

Nevertheless the book is unsatisfactory. Instead of sticking to his Greek thesis Mr Knight combines it loosely with much general discussion of Nietzsche's personality and significance. This, I think, was mistaken. First, because the thesis, once re-opened, calls for a fuller treatment than it gets. Joel's provocative chapter on 'Nietzsche und die Antike' should certainly have been discussed and Mr Knight himself submits that Nietzsche and the Greeks alone 'would afford material enough for more than one book.' But the stronger reason why he should have stuck to his initial theme is that it is only here that he sees his subject clearly. On Nietzsche in general he has no clear views, being divided, it would seem, between putting him on a pedestal and putting him in the melting-pot. On p. 88 *Zarathustra* is 'one of the greatest works of all literature,' yet on p. 111 it becomes 'extremely probable' that Nietzsche's 'foundations will crumble, and his work will have to be revalued.' There cannot be true criticism where there is no standpoint; this basic uncertainty is fatal to all Mr Knight's general observations.

Moreover, the book does not seem to have been properly revised. It suffers from glaring discrepancies which suggest that no one prior to publication can have read it through as a whole. Thus on p. 5 Nietzsche is 'treacherous and cruel,' while on p. 50 he is 'of a mild, kind, gentle disposition'; on p. 2 he is 'an extremely valuable (and generally accurate) critic of his times,' and on p. 188 'he usually appears as a harsh, uncompromising, unfair critic of his countrymen's attitude to life'; a careful reading of p. 87 will show that in one paragraph Goethe is identified with the 'religion of Dionysus' and in the next completely dissociated from it. It is difficult to resist the impression that this was a book well conceived and prepared for and then hastily enlarged.

BARKER FAIRLEY.

MANCHESTER.

## SHORT NOTICES

The object of Dr Frank Behre's treatise on *The Subjunctive in Old English Poetry* (Goteborg: Wettergren & Kerbers Forlag iv+320 pp. Kr 15) is to determine by an examination of the uses of the subjunctive in Old English poetry—as being less liable than the prose texts to the taint of Latin—the principles that lie behind the employment of that mood in Old English generally, and so to penetrate into the 'real nature of the subjunctive'.

The topic is intriguing, and one would have accepted cheerfully the inevitable new classification of uses and even have become reconciled to a 'Meditative-Polemic Subjunctive' or to the difference between a 'Volitional-Meditative,' and a 'Meditative-Volitional,' subjunctive—if only the author's handling of his material and argumentation had inspired confidence.

However this is the sort of thing we find—diversified with the usual abuse of other workers in the same field

The primary factor determining the OE. use of the subjunctive in expressions of propriety of this type is consequently the unreality (remoteness) of the activity to which such an expression refers and not the unreality (remoteness) of the propriety or fitness of this activity. Yet, by using the subjunctive in the clause of propriety, the Anglo-Saxon brings also the propriety into the sphere of unreality as if implying that the proper or fitting state of a given situation would (have) come true only if a certain proper or fitting thing were done (or had been done). In other words, to the Anglo-Saxon mind, propriety or fitness in a given case is unreal or remote, if the proper and fitting action of the case is unrealizable or remote.

Nor are the renderings of Old English verse happier in view of. 'the laden water-horse rushed to the hithe, so that, after its ocean-play, the floater of the surge contemned the sandy shore, and ground against the gravel.'

The book, in a word, does not merit any serious consideration.

A. O. B.

*Yr Areithau Pros*, by Dr Gwenallt Jones (Caerdydd. Gwasg Pryfysgol Cymru. 1934. xx+131 pp. 6s.), is a collection of 'Prose Addresses' written before the latter half of the sixteenth century. In reality, the volume consists of exercises by budding bards serving their apprenticeship in letters. It was by such exercises that novices in the Bardic Schools would exhibit their skill in the technique of what was a very exacting métier. The rhetorical ramp, the 'ornamenta scribendi' of the mere stylist, are all here.

Some of the addresses parody the style of the Arthurian Legends; others deal with the 'amour courtois'; while others are long-winded and high-flown expressions on likes and dislikes. Altogether they make delightful reading.

An excellent introduction and copious notes render the volume in-



valuable not only to students of Welsh, but also to the specialist interested in the broader aspect of comparative literature.

The Welsh University Press is to be complimented on the get-up of this book  
S. J.

Mr Alexander Corbin Judson enjoyed his holiday in Munster, and has communicated something of his enjoyment by publishing some well-taken and well-reproduced photographs in his *Spenser in Southern Ireland* (Bloomington, Indiana. The Principia Press, Inc 1933 60 pp. (17 illustrations and 1 map). No price stated). It was worth doing, though a description of the present aspect of the country, and a photograph of modern Doneraile, are not entirely relevant. Mr Judson's enjoyment and the fine weather cast a glow over Kilcolman, he demurs from Miss Henley's description of it as lonely. But the presence of breeding sea-gulls should have been proof enough of Miss Henley's accuracy, and a photograph from the Rossagh side would show it not only lonely, but far from rich—whence Spenser's difficulties with his neighbour Lord Roche. It is a pity that Father Mole is not photogenic, and Mr Judson would have found a nobler view of Galtymore from the gap in the hills on the Lismore-Clogheen road—a view that convinced one spectator of Spenser's rightness of choice for an assembly-place of the Gods. Mr Judson has produced a pleasant little book, all the better for his manifest pleasure in it.  
W. L. R.

In *Elizabethan Plays* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co.; London: Macmillan. 1933. x+1174 pp. 15s.) the aim of Professor Hazelton Spencer has been to print enough masterpieces to represent 'the main currents of drama in Shakespeare's time and just after.' On the face of it, one would have preferred to have been given access to more out-of-the-way if less masterly plays, since most of the twenty-eight here reprinted have been reprinted often. But the editor has well justified his work. He has taken great care over his texts and over annotating obscure meanings precisely and usefully. Such a book might easily have been compiled perfunctorily. Instead it has been put together by a scholar at pains to make it good. One can only hope that the editor will follow up this volume by another twenty-eight plays which cannot be found in common books like the *Mermaids*. Perhaps in such a sequel he might cease from at least a thorough modernisation of his texts. It seems pointless to rearrange the entry of a character when a note on the Elizabethan stage would make the original text not only clear but interesting.  
G. T.

Fraülein Johanna Birnbaum's study of the biographical, pseudo-biographical, scandal-mongering and covertly libellous writings that preceded or were contemporaneous with our early fiction (*Die 'Memoirs' um 1700: eine Studie zur Entwicklung der realistischen Romankunst vor Richardson*. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1934. 117 pp. R.M. 4.50) is largely of a bibliographical nature, and not free from errors which are con-

sequently more unfortunate. It is a slight affair, and does not seem to make much addition to general knowledge. Nor is anything better to be said of an article, *The Technique of Letter Fiction in English from 1740 to 1800*, by F. G. Black, which is the occasion for our reference to the fifteenth volume of *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* (ed. G. H. Maynard. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press. 1933). It is a dull and purely mechanical treatment of the subject; and the writer never comes to grips with the real problem of technique, how the method can be made effective for the imagination and feelings, how it can induce that 'willing suspension of belief' desiderated by Coleridge, and the other questions that ensue.

E. A. B.

In 1775 Percy planned a companion volume to the *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, procured designs for an engraved title-page, a frontispiece and other smaller illustrations, and saw most of the text in proof. For some reason the book was not published, but Percy kept the proofs, the illustrations and the copper-plates, which ultimately found their way to the Bodleian Library. There Mr John Johnson discovered the nature of the plates, and took, as Dr Nichol Smith explains, 'the main part in bringing together the scattered portions of the abandoned venture, and in deciding that it should at last go forward to completion. He has also required that it should be furnished with this modern Preface'—in which Dr Nichol Smith surveys Percy's share in advancing the study of Spanish literature in this country. There is reason to be grateful both for Percy's habit of preserving everything, and for Mr Johnson's insistence on making the right use of this particular hoard, since they have united to produce a very beautiful book under the title which Percy intended for it. *Ancient Songs, chiefly on Moorish Subjects, translated from the Spanish* (Oxford: University Press. 1933. xviii+56 pp. and illustrations. 42s.).

E. C. B.

The third volume of *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies* (edited by William J. Entwistle. Oxford: University Press. 1933. 186 pp. 7s. 6d.) is dedicated to Professor J. G. Robertson, 'rerum germanicarum interpreti optimo,' whose death last year has left a gap not only in Germanic studies. Professor Entwistle has again secured the collaboration of a body of scholars, both British and foreign, in the presentation of a survey of books and periodical literature covering the year ending June 30, 1932. The contributions are of three kinds, consisting either of a running commentary with book-lists as footnotes, of book-lists with occasional comment on individual works, or of book-lists only. The commentary of the first type of contribution can, as a rule, only provide the illusion of continuity, and perhaps the second type, divided into suitable sections, is the most useful as well as being clearer to the eye.

The survey is divided into five groups—Mediæval Latin, Romance, Germanic, Celtic and Slavonic, the bulk of the space being taken up by Romance and Germanic, though we notice in the case of the latter the

omission of the Scandinavian languages and literatures. The editing of the volume as a whole is worthy of all praise, and linguistic and literary studies in the English-speaking countries are under a debt to Professor Entwistle for undertaking this yearly task. It needs considerable fortitude and tact to persuade a group of scholars to work to a time-table.

W. R.

Nature in Ronsard's poetry might be a charming subject, but Dr W. B. Cornelia in his *Classical Sources of the Nature References in Ronsard's Poetry* (Publ. of the Inst. of French Studies, Columbia University, N. Y.; Paris Droz. 1934. 226 pp. \$2.00) has wittingly limited himself to its most arid and artificial aspect. In his first chapter he discusses the two-fold relations of Nature and the poet: the poet's sensitiveness to natural beauty on the one hand, his more or less conventional use of images drawn from Nature on the other. This second relation is the subject of this work. The second chapter, on Nature in the writings of classical antiquity, is vague and inconclusive, being largely a summary of leading existing opinions. Dr Cornelia has read carefully through Ronsard, and having picked out the appropriate images, has turned to the ancients (we find, incidentally, little of Pliny) in standard translations. The result of this patience and industry is that we have between two covers much that is to be found scattered through the many pages of Laumonier and some parallels not found there are gathered into an appendix. The parallels are arranged, in the body of the work, under convenient heads: Flowers; the Rose; Trees, the Sea; the Animal World, Birds and Insects; Astronomical Figures; and Physical Science, which covers phenomena fitting ill into the above categories; Daemons; the Atomic Theory; the Antipodes; Lightning; the Salamander and the like. While footnotes give references to the ancient poets, only English translations are given, with the curious result that barely half a dozen words of Greek or Latin are to be found in the book; real comparison of passages, taking stock of verbal as well as sense parallels, is thereby hindered. It is a pity, too, that references to Ronsard are (outside the appendix) to Vaganay's edition exclusively, and that Ronsard extracts are not printed in verse form proper. The punctuation is occasionally odd (e.g. p. 147) and the subject leads the writer to cliché and commonplace (p. 155, the robin illustration verges on the absurd). The book, however, can be useful, and it is certainly the fruit of a real enthusiasm for Ronsard and of much diligence and labour.

H. W. L.

By the courtesy of Sr Aramon i Serra we have received a copy of the fifth volume (nominally of 1932) of the *Anuari de l'Oficina romànica de lingüística i literatura*, issued by the Biblioteca Balmes, of Barcelona, and we take the opportunity of drawing the attention of all Romance students to this excellent publication. It takes for its province the whole Romance field, though primarily concerned with Catalan, and it embraces the departments of linguistics, literary criticism and bibliography. The last-

named section includes a complete bibliography of Catalan language and literature by Sr Aramon i Serra, and informative reviews which add considerably to the works they notice. The literary studies in this number are an appreciation of the *Asolani* by H. Rabow, who seeks to characterise Bembo's work with reference to the 'second generation' of the Italian Renaissance; and F. de B. Moll proposes a model critical edition of one of Lull's poems (*Lo Pecat d'Adam*), taking into account all the manuscript evidence. He urges that the Lullian centenary should be commemorated by a critical text of his lyrics. The linguistic studies are more numerous, and derive particular interest from their association with the Catalan Linguistic Atlas. Father A. Griera begins a series of word-studies designed to illustrate the effect of homonyms on language. He thinks that the comparative indifference of present-day Romanists to Gilliéron's theories is due to their external relationship with the matter they study. They do not 'live the dialects,' and so have not the finer perception needed to detect homonymy in its subtler effects. H. Kuen begins an account of the dialect of Alghero (phonetics, in this volume), which is of considerable interest. More specialised matter is found in F. de B. Moll's lists of Catalan verbal forms as revealed by the Atlas; his and Father Serra's account of curious living usages collected by the latter, and M. Batllori's extracts from the Catalan veterinary treatise of the fifteenth century preserved at Bologna.

W. J. E.

It is evident from Herr Johannes Siebert's foreword that he considers his book, *Der Dichter Tannhauser, Leben-Gedichte-Sage* (Halle M. Niemeyer, 1934. vii+249 pp. 10 M.), to be primarily an annotated edition of Tannhauser's poems. As such it is more reliable though less handy than S. Singer's (Tubingen, 1922). There is a detailed study of Tannhauser's metre, a subject on which Siebert wrote a dissertation as early as 1894, as introduction to the poems. This includes a discussion of the recently discovered melody of the fourth Leich. In his text Siebert has generally preferred the readings of the MS. to emendations of editors, his seventy pages of notes deal with the interpretation of obscure passages, points of metre and historical allusion (vii, 42, viii, 16, ix, 42, and in spite of Siebert's efforts vi, 19, xiii, 27 remain obscure). The 'Hofzucht' and 'Bußheder' attributed to the poet are examined and rejected.

In the first section (*Leben*), Siebert decides in favour of Tannhausen near Neumarkt as the home of the poet. His summing up on p. 77 is an impassioned attack on R. M. Meyer's article in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. In the last chapter (*Sage*) the author merely shows that Tannhäuser the repentant sinner became a literary figure, soon after the death of the poet. The introduction of Tannhauser as the hero of the Venusberg legend (which the author does not discuss) remains a 'fait accompli' which there is no explaining.

F. P. P.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS

July—September 1934

With the collaboration of Dr MARY S SERJEANTSON (English)  
and Dr A. GILLIES (German).

### GENERAL

- ALLEN, P. S., *Erasmus and Wayfaring Sketches* Oxford, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.  
ATKINS, J. W. H., *Literary Criticism in Antiquity: a Sketch of its development.*  
2 vols. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25s.  
BOHIGAS, P., *Resum d'història del llibre* (Coll. Pop.). Barcelona, Barcino.  
3 50 ptas.  
CARNAP, R., *Logische Syntax der Sprache* (Schr. z. wiss. Weltauffassung, 8)  
Vienna, Springer. 21 M. 80.  
ECKER, L., *Arabischer, provenzalischer und deutscher Minnesang.* Bern,  
Haupt. 6 M.  
Essais sur Kierkegaard, Pétrarque, Goethe. Paris, Desclée De Brouwer. 20 fr.  
FAIDER, P., *Catalogue des manuscrits conservés à Namur, I* (Cat. gén. des mss.  
des bibl. de Belgique). Paris, Belles Lettres. 100 fr.  
FINK, A. H., *Maxime und Fragment* (Wortkunst, N.F. 9). Munich, Hueber.  
4 M. 50.  
GOMBEL, H., *Die Fabel 'Vom Magen und den Ghedern' in der Weltliteratur*  
(Beih. z. Zeit. f. rom. Phil., 80). Halle, Niemeyer. 9 M.  
HAMILTON, J. I., *Landschaftswertung im Bau höfischer Epen.* Bonn, Kubens.  
LICHTENBERGER *Mélanges Henri Lichtenberger.* Paris, Stock. 30 fr.  
PRAMPOLINI, G., *Storia universale della letteratura, II.* Turin, U.T.E.T. L. 145.  
Slovenska sodobna lirika, ed. A. Vodnik, pref. A. Lažar. Ljubljana, Jugo-  
slovenska Knjigarna.  
VOGT, HILDE, *Die literarische Personenschilderung des frühen Mittelalters*  
(Beiträge z. Kulturgeh. d. Mittelalters, 53). Leipzig, Teubner. 3 M. 50.

### ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- GAMILLSCHEG, E., *Romania Germanica, I* (Grundriss d. germ. Phil., II, 1).  
Berlin, De Gruyter. 11 M.  
KLETT, E., *Die romanischen Erbschennamen unter bes. Berucks. von*  
*Frankreich und Italien.* Tübingen, Gölde, 1929 (publ. 1934).  
MEYER-LÜBKE, W., *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* 3. Aufl. Laef. 16.  
Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M. 50.

### Mediaeval Latin.

- BAXTER, J. H., C. JOHNSON and PHYLLIS ABRAHAMS, *Medieval Latin Word-*  
*List from British and Irish Sources.* Oxford, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.  
CAPLAN, H., *Mediaeval Artes Prædicandæ: a Handlist* (Stud. in Class. Phil., 24).  
Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 4s. 6d.  
GILSON, E., *La Théologie mystique de saint Bernard* (Études de philosophie  
médiévale). Paris, Vrin. 25 fr.  
LINDSAY, J., *Medieval Latin Poets.* London, Elkin Matthews and Marrot.  
7s. 6d.  
PSEUDO-TURPIN. *Codex Quartus Sancti Jacobi de expedimento et conver-*  
*sione Yspanie et Gallecie, editus a beato Turpino archiepiscopo,* ed.  
Ward Thoron (Vat. MS. C128). Medieval Academy of America.

**Italian.**

- ALFIERI, Merope, ed. P. Leonetti. Naples, Rondinella. L. 3 80.  
 BIGNAMI, L., Condottieri Visconti e Sforzeschi Milan, Agnelli L. 20.  
 CASCIANELLI, R., Perchè l' Ariosto non fu fatto cardinale. Rome, Cosmopoli.  
 L 4  
 CHIOVENDA, LUCIA, Die Zeichnungen Petrarca's (Teildr.). Florence, Olschki.  
 COSTANTINO, D., Scrittori ed Opere del dopoguerra. Catania, Le Pagine. L. 8.  
 DENT, E J., Music of the Italian Renaissance (British Academy). Oxford, Univ.  
 Press 1s 6d.  
 FERRARA, F., Ugo Foscolo. Palermo, Boccone del Povero  
 MANZONI, I Promessi Sposi, ed. C Massolo Testa. Palermo, Trimalchi L 12.  
 MARTINI. Catalogo della libreria di Giuseppe Martini, 1: Incunabuli Milan,  
 Hoepli. L 2 50.  
 MOMIGLIANO, A., Storia della letteratura italiana, II Dal Tasso all' Alfieri.  
 Messina, Principato. L 7.  
 PARIGI, L., Dante dov' è? Milan, Perella L. 3.  
 PAZZI, G., Il 'Belvedere' ferrarese nei versi di Ariosto e di Balbo. Rome,  
 Cosmopoli. L 4  
 PAZZI, G., Pescara nata nell' opera di Gabriele d'Annunzio. Rome, Cosmo-  
 poli. L. 8  
 SERRA, R., Epistolario, ed. Ambrosini, De Robertis, Grilli. Florence, Le  
 Monnier L. 25.  
 SPINELLI DI SANTELENA, Alessandro Bagnato. Bari, Quaderni del Levante.  
 TASSO, T., Gerusalemme Conquistata, ed. L. Bonfigli (Scrittori d' Italia)  
 2 vols. Bari, Laterza. L 60.  
 TITONE, V., La Poesia del Pascoli e la critica italiana. Palermo, Boccone del  
 Povero. L 6.

**Spanish, Catalan, Basque.**

- AGUILAR, MARÍA, Estudio biobibliográfico de don Manuel Eduardo de Gorostiza.  
 Mexico, Renacimiento 2 50 ptas.  
 ALCALÁ VENCESLADA, A., Vocabulario andaluz. Andújar, La Puritana.  
 10 ptas.  
 ALCÁZAR MOLINA, C., El conde de Floridablanca, I Madrid, Impr. Helénica.  
 10 ptas.  
 ALMELA Y VIVES, F., La Literatura Valenciana. Valencia, Miguel Juan.  
 2.50 ptas  
 ANDERSSON, T., Carlos María Ocantos (Yale Romanic Studies, viii). Yale and  
 Oxford Univ Presses. \$1 50  
 ARCO, R. DEL, La Erudición aragonesa en el siglo XVI: en torno a Lastanosa.  
 Madrid, Góngora. 12 ptas  
 BAIG BAÑOS, A., La Mancha y Cervantes Madrid, Artes Gráficas. 3 ptas.  
 BERGMANN, W., Studien zur volkstümlichen Kultur im Grenzgebiet von  
 Hocharagon und Navarra (Stud. z. Volkstum u. Kultur d. Romanen,  
 16). Hamburg, Rom. Seminar. 4 M.  
 BOUDA, K., Baskisch (Lautbibliothek, 88-93) Berlin, Inst. f. Lautforschung.  
 6 M.  
 CARRO, J., En la enigmática Maragatería. Importantes descubrimientos  
 arqueológicos. Madrid, Pueyo. 5 ptas.  
 CASTILLO LEDÓN, L., La Conquista y Colonización española en México Mexico,  
 Museo Nacional. 3.50 ptas.

- CORTS, J., *Ideario político de Balmes*. Madrid, Gráfica Universal 5 ptas
- COSSÍO, J. M. DE, *La Obra literaria de Pereda*. Santander, J. Martínez. 6 ptas
- COTARELO, E., *Sobre el Quijote de Avellaneda y acerca de su autor verdadero* Madrid, Archivos 5 ptas.
- DESCLOT, Chronicle, 1134-1275, trsl. Critchlow. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses 22s 6d.
- Discovery of the Amazon, according to the account of Friar Gaspar de Carvajal and other documents, as published with an introduction by José Toribio Medina, trsl B Lee, ed. H. C. Heaton. New York, American Geographical Society. \$5
- DONOSO CORTÉS, *Pensamientos* (Nueva Bibl Filosófica, lxxiii) Madrid, Espasa-Calpe 7 ptas
- GÉNIN, A., *Les Français au Mexique du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle à nos jours*. Paris, Nouv éd Argo 80 fr
- GONZÁLEZ DE LA CALLE, P. U., *El Poeta aragonés Juan Sobrarias* Zaragoza, Martínez.
- GONZÁLEZ LLUBERA, I., *The Coplas de Yocef: a medieval Spanish poem in Hebrew characters*. Cambridge, Univ. Press 7s 6d. (Announced)
- GONZÁLEZ LÓPEZ, L., *Las Mujeres de D. Juan Valera*. Jaen, Sánchez. 5 ptas
- HENRÍQUEZ UREÑA, P., *Sobre el Problema del andalucismo dialectal de América*. Madrid, Hernando. 9 ptas.
- HERRERA, A. DE, *Historia general de los hechos de los castellanos en las Islas y Tierra Firme del Océano*, I, II. Madrid, Archivos. 60 ptas.
- HESELER, MARIA, *Studien zur Figur des gracioso bei Lope de Vega und Vorgängern* Hildesheim, Borgmeyer
- IBN KHALDOUN, *Prolégomènes*, trsl De Slane. 3 vols Paris, Geuthner. 350 fr.
- JULIÁ, E., *La Métrica en las producciones dramáticas de Guillen de Castro*. Madrid, Author. 2 ptas.
- LULL, R., *Obres*, xvii. Palma, Amengual i Muntaner 26.75 ptas
- MEJÍA, P., *Silva de varia lección*, I (Soc. de Bibliófilos esp) Santander, Aldus. 30 ptas.
- MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, R., *The Cid and his Spain*, trsl H. Sunderland. London, Murray 18s
- ORTEGA MOREJÓN, J. M. DE, *La Muerte de Ezpeleta: proceso relacionado con Cervantes*. Valencia, Tip. Artística. 5 ptas.
- PENZOL, P., *Algunos itinerarios en la literatura castellana*. Madrid, Góngora.
- PUG PEÑA, F., *La Influencia de Francisco de Vitoria en la obra de Hugo Grocio*. Madrid, Archivos. 10 ptas.
- SÁNCHEZ-ALBORNOZ, C., *Estampas de la vida en León durante el siglo x*. 2nd ed Madrid, Espasa-Calpe 15 ptas.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, *El Caballero de Olmedo*, ed. Miss I. I. Macdonald. Cambridge, Univ Press 4s
- VEGA, LOPE DE, *Obras dramáticas escogidas*, ed. E. Juliá, I: *Teatro religioso*. Madrid, Hernando. 4 ptas.
- VITORIA, F. DE, *Comentarios a la Secunda Secundæ de Santo Tomás*, iv: *De Justitia*. Salamanca 20 ptas.
- WEISS, R., *Un Poemita desconocido de Cosme de Aldana*. Badajoz, Centro de Est. Extremeños. 4 ptas.

### Portuguese.

- LOPES, FERNÃO, *Crónica de D. Pedro I*, ed. D. Peres. Barcelos, Portucalense.
- VICENTE, GIL, *Poesías*, ed. D. Alonso. Madrid, Cruz y Raya. 3 ptas.

## French.

(Place of publication is Paris, unless otherwise stated )

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- BECKER, P. A., Der gepaarte Achtsilber in d. franz. Dichtung (Abhl. d. sachs. Akad. d. Wiss., xlii, 1) Leipzig, Hirzel. 7 M. 75
- BELOWSKI, ELEANORE, Lukrez in der französischen Literatur der Renaissance (Rom. Stud., 36) Berlin, Ebering. 5 M. 20.
- BEMENT, N. S., French Modal Syntax in the Sixteenth Century (Univ. Michigan Publications: Language and Literature, xi) Ann Arbor, Univ. Michigan Press. \$2.50.
- WARTBURG, W. VON, Franzos. etym. Wörterbuch, Lfg. 27. *frisk-fundus*. Leipzig, Teubner.

(b) *Old French.*

- CHARRIER, CHARLOTTE, Heloise dans l'histoire et dans la légende (Bibl. Rev. Litt. Comp., ci) Champion. 75 fr.
- HAHNEL, K., Sprachliche Untersuchung zur Alexius-Handschrift 'V.' Coburg, Rossteutscher.
- JEAN DE MEUN, Traduction de la première Épître de Pierre Abélard. Champion. 40 fr.
- ROSENBERG, RUTH, Zur künstlerischen Entwicklung des Philippe de Champagne. Diss. Munich.
- SAUTER, H., Wortgut und Dichtung: eine lexicographisch-literaturgeschichtliche Studie über den Verfasser der altfranzösischen Cantefable 'Aucassin et Nicolette' (Arb. z. rom. Phil., 14) Münster, Rom. Sem. 7 M.

(c) *Modern French.*

- BAILLY, A., Richelieu. Fayard. 15 fr.
- BALZAC, H. DE, Letters to his Family (1809-1850), ed. W. S. Hastings. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 22s. 6d.
- BENEDETTO, L. F., Indiscrétions sur Giuglia. Divan.
- BINDEL, V., Claudel. Vrin. 20 fr.
- BRUGGER, IRENE, Frauentypen bei George Sand. Ochsenfurt, Fritz und Rappart.
- BRUGMANS, H., Georges de Porto-Riche. Droz. 50 fr.
- CHISHOLM, A. R., Towards Hérodiade. Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses. 6s.
- CIAMPINI, R., Un Osservatore Italiano della Rivoluzione Francese. Florence, Rinascimento del Libro. L. 4.
- EHRENBURG, I., Duhamel, Gide, Malraux, Mauriac, Morand, Romans, Unamuno vus par un écrivain d'U.R.S.S. Nouv. rev. fr. 15 fr.
- FÉNELON, Lettre à l'Académie. Classiques Delagrave. 5 fr.
- FÉNELON, Télémaque. 2 vols. Génie de la France. 10 fr.
- FERGUSON, W. D., The Influence of Flaubert on George Moore. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 6s. 6d.
- FISCHER, E., Voltaire als Pädagoge. Leipzig, Druckerei d. Werkgemeinschaft.
- FRIES, W., Der Stil der Theaterstücke Rotrou. Würzburg, Mayr.
- FUCHS, A., Les Apports français dans l'œuvre de Wieland de 1772 à 1789 (Bibl. Rev. Litt. Comp., ci). Champion. 85 fr.
- GAROSCI, A., Jean Bodin: Politica e diritto nel Rinascimento francese. Milan, Corticelli.



- GIBEL, O., *Der Stil Hérédias in seinen 'Trophées.'* Limburg, Limburger Vereinsdr.
- GIDE, A., *Œuvres complètes*, vi. Nouv. rev. fr. 75 fr.
- GILLOT, H., *Chateaubriand ses idées, son action, son œuvre* (Publ. Fac. Lettres, Strasbourg). Presses Universitaires 30 fr.
- GMELIN, H., *Französische Geistesform in Sainte-Beuve, Renan und Taine* (Gedanken und Gestalten, 5) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt
- HUNG CHENG FU, *Un Siècle d'influence chinoise sur la littérature française, 1815-1930* Domat-Monchrestien. 30 fr.
- JACKEL, HILDE, *Der Engländer im Spiegel der französischen Literatur von der Romantik bis zum Weltkrieg* Breslau, Priebatsch.
- JASPAR, M. H., *Ernest Renan et sa République.* Albert 12 fr
- KEELING, S. V., *Descartes (Leaders in Philosophy)* London, Benn. 12s. 6d
- KRANZFELDER, H. R., *Die Hirtendichtung und die dramatischen Pastoralen Alexander Hardys.* Diss. Munich
- LA FONTAINE, *Fables, livres I-VI.* 2 vols. Classiques Delagrave. 10 fr.
- LICHTENBERGER, MARGUERITE, *Écrivains français en Égypte contemporaine (de 1870 à nos jours)* Leroux 20 fr
- LOMBARD, A., *Flaubert et saint Antoine* Attinger. 15 fr.
- MAES, P., *Victor Jacquemont (Temps et Visages).* Desclée De Brouwer 30 fr.
- MERRYLEES, W. A., *Descartes* Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses 12s. 6d.
- MIÉVILLE, H. L., *La Pensée de Maurice Barrès (Essais Critiques).* Nouv. rev. crit. 12 fr.
- MILLER, L. G., *Index de la Correspondance de Gustave Flaubert.* Gamber. 125 fr
- MUSSET, *Comédies et Proverbes (Textes français).* Roches. 18 fr.
- NORDICK, AGNES, *Der Stil der Marchen Perraults* Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus (also in *Arb. z. rom. Phil.*, 10)
- PAILLERON, MARIE-LOUISE, *La Vicomtesse de Chateaubriand.* Portiques. 15 fr.
- PETER, R., *Vie secrète de l'Académie française* Lib. des Champs-Élysées. 12 fr
- PIERRE-QUINT, L., *André Gide. his life and work*, trsl. Dorothy M. Richardson. London, Cape 7s. 6d.
- POTTER, K., *Die Weltanschauung Paul Claudels* Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.
- PUJARNISCLE, E., *Philoxène ou de la littérature coloniale.* Firmin-Didot. 5 fr.
- RABELAIS, *The Five Books and minor writings*, trsl. ed. W. F. Smith, rev. D. H. Beves, i. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 30s.
- RICHTER, K., *François de Curel.* Grimmer, Bode.
- SCHNEIDER, E., *Victor Hugos 'Hernani' in der Kritik eines Jahrhunderts, 1830-1930.* Erlangen, Junge.
- SCHULZ, AGNES, *Die Sprachkunst Théophile Gautiers.* Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.
- SÉCHAUD, P., *Victor Laprade.* Picard. 40 fr
- STEIS, A., *Das Motiv des Ennui bei Alfred de Musset.* Würzburg, Mayr.
- TALLEMANT DES RÉAUX, *Histoires, VIII*, ed. Mongrédien. Garnier. 12 fr.
- VALÉRY, P., *Œuvres complètes.* Nouv. rev. fr. 120 fr.
- WEBER, JULIA, *Jean Moréas und die französische Tradition.* Nurnberg, Volkhardt und Wilbert.

WEISE, CHARLOTTE, J. K. Huysmanns Beziehungen zur Malerei. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus

WICKELGREN, FLORENCE L., La Mothe le Vayer: sa vie et son œuvre. Droz. 40 fr.

### **Provençal.**

JONES, J. D., La Tenson provençale. Paris, Droz.

Lyrische Auswahl aus der Fehlbredichtung, herausg. von K. Voretzsch  
Texte (Sammlung rom. Übungstexte, xxiii) Halle, Niemeyer 3 M.

### **Rhætoromance, Rumanian.**

CARNOT, M. P., Im Lande der Rhætoromanen. Sprachliches und Sachliches vom Graubündner Inn und Rhein. Zurich, Polygraph. Verl. 4 M 80

DRĂGANU, N., Români în veacurile IX-XIV pe baza toponimiei și a onomasticei. Bucharest, Impr. Națională

LOGHIN, C. und S. DRIMMER, Geschichte der rumanische Literatur. Cernauf, Wicentowicz. 2 M 50

LOPELMANN, M., Aus der Volksdichtung der Macedo-rumanen. Leipzig, Armanen-Verl. 2 M. 85.

SETON-WATSON, R. W., A History of the Rumanians. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 25s.

### **GERMANIC LANGUAGES.**

KRAUSE, W., Beiträge zur Runenforschung, 2. Heft. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 2 M 60.

SCHNEIDER, H., Germanische Heldensage II. Band. 2 Abteilung. (Grundriss der germ. Phil., 10/3.) Berlin and Leipzig, W. de Gruyter. 6 M. 50.

### **Scandinavian.**

JANSSON, VALTER, Fornsvenska Legendariet (Nord Text. och Undersökningar, 4). Stockholm, H. Geber 6 kr 50.

LEIJSTROM, GUNNAR, Om obestanda artikeln (Nord Text. och Undersökningar, 3) Stockholm, H. Geber. 5 kr.

SCHLAUCH, MARGARET, Romance in Iceland (American Scandinavian Foundation). Princeton, Univ. Press. \$2 00.

ZETTERHOLM, D. O., Atlamál. Studier i en eddadikts stil och meter (Nord. Text. och Undersökningar, 2) Stockholm, H. Geber. 4 kr.

### **English.**

#### *(a) General (including Linguistic).*

BAKER, E. A., The History of the Novel: The Novel of Sentiment and the Gothic Romance. London, Witherby 16s

DAVIES, CONSTANCE, English Pronunciation from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century. London, Dent 6s.

DOUGLAS, W. C., The Pastoral Elegy in English. Madras, Oxford University Press. 1s.

LEAVIS, F. R., Determinations. Critical Essays. London, Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6d.

WALLENBERG, J. K., The Place Names of Kent. Uppsala, Appelberg. 15 kr.

WYLD, H. C., The Universal Dictionary of the English Language. (Re-issue.) London, Routledge. 21s.

(b) *Old and Middle English*

CARNEGIE, F. A. R., The Relations between the Social and Divine Order in William Langland's 'Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman' (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und römischen Völker, A xii) Breslau, Priebatsch 3 M.

The Exeter Book, Part II. Poems ix-xxxii. Ed. by W. S. Mackie (E.E.T.S., 194) London, H. Milford. 18s.

Sainte Marherete, pe Meiden ant Martyr. Ed. by Frances M. Mack. (E.E.T.S., 193) London, H. Milford

(c) *Modern English.*

BAILEY, RUTH, Shelley. London, Duckworth. 2s

BLODGETT, H., Walt Whitman in England (Cornell Studies in English, xxiv) New York, Cornell Univ. Press, London, H. Milford. 11s 6d

BOYD, A. J., Arnold and the Grand Style. Madras, Oxford Univ. Press. 1s.

BREDVOLD, L. I., The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden (Univ. of Michigan Publications. Lang. and Lit., xii). Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan Press \$2 50.

BRIDGES, ROBERT, Collected Essays, Papers, etc., xvi-xx. London, H. Milford. 2s 6d

BURDETT, O., The Rev. Smith, Sydney. London, Chapman and Hall. 15s

CARTER, J. and G. POLLARD, An Inquiry into the Nature of Certain Nineteenth Century Pamphlets. London, Constable. 15s.

Coleridge Studies by Several Hands on the Hundredth Anniversary of his Death. Ed. by E. Blunden and E. L. Griggs. London, Constable. 10s. 6d.

CUBBON, W., Thomas Edward Brown. A Biography. Douglas, I. O. M., Manx Museum

DOBRÉE, B., Modern Prose Style. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6s.

EVANS, B. I., English Poetry in the Nineteenth Century. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 1s.

HAZLITT, W., Complete Works, ed. by P. P. Howe. Vols. xx, xxi. London, Dent. 15 guineas the set of 21 vols.

HILL, F. P., American Plays. Printed 1714-1830. A Bibliographical Record. Stanford, Cal., Stanford Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 16s.

LEISHMAN, JUDITH B., The Metaphysical Poets. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10s.

LIEBERMAN, J. B., Robert Browning and Hebraism. Jerusalem.

LYDGATE, J., Minor Poems, Part II. Ed. by H. N. MacCracken. (E.E.T.S., 192.) London, H. Milford. 30s.

MAY, J. LEWIS, Charles Lamb. A Study. London, Bles. 10s. 6d

MOORE, C. A., Restoration Literature. Poetry and Prose, 1660-1700. New York, Crofts. \$4.

RAO, A. V., A Minor Augustan. Calcutta, Book Company. 12s 6d

ROSSETTI, W. M., Letters to Anne Gilchrist and Herbert Gilchrist, ed. by C. Gohdes and P. F. Baum. Durham, N.C., Duke Univ. Press; London, Cambridge Univ. Press. 11s. 6d.

SARGENT, D., Thomas More. London, Sheed and Ward. 7s 6d.

SCOTT, Sir W., Letters, 1821-1823. Ed. by H. J. C. Grierson. London, Constable. 18s

SHELLEY, P. B., Verse and Prose from the Manuscripts. Ed. by Sir J. C. E. Shelley-Rolls and R. Ingpen. London, Zaehnsdorf. 21s.

- SISSON, C J, *The Mythical Sorrows of Shakespeare* (Brit Acad. Shakespeare Lecture, 1934) London, H Milford. 2s.
- SMITH, W. H., *Architecture in English Fiction* (Yale Studies in English, lxxxiii). Yale and Oxford Univ Presses 11s. 6d
- TAYLOR, G C, *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 8s 6d
- VOLLMANN, ELISABETH, *Ursprung und Entwicklung des Monologs bis zu seiner Entfaltung bei Shakespeare* (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie, xxii) Bonn, Hanstein 6 M 90
- WHITNEY, LOIS, *Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century* Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s 6d
- WILSON, D. A. and D W MACARTHUR, *Carlyle in Old Age*. London, Kegan Paul 15s
- WILSON, J. DOVER, *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' and the Problems of its Transmission* (Shakespeare Problems, iv) 2 vols. Cambridge, Univ Press 15s.

**German.**

(a) *General (including Linguistic)*

- FIESEL, L., *Ortsnamenforschung und fruhmittelalterliche Siedlung in Niedersachsen* (Teuthonista) 2 M. 40
- PRIEBSCHE, R. and W E COLLINSON, *The German Language*. London, Faber and Faber 18s.
- STROH, F., *Der volkhafte Sprachbegriff*. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M

(b) *Old and Middle High German*

- Manessische Handschrift. *Die Minnesinger aus der Manessischen Liederhandschrift*. 48 M.

(c) *Modern German*

- AEERHARDT, W E, *Jeremias Gotthelf und Solothurn* (Den Mitgliedern der Schweizer Bibliophilengesellschaft anlassl der 12. Jahrestagung in Solothurn gewidmet) Solothurn. 1 fr. 50
- ARNDT, E. M., *Volk und Staat Seine Schriften in Auswahl*, hg v. P. Requadt. Leipzig, Kroner (Kroners Taschenausgaben, 117) 3 M. 25.
- BARTELS, A., *Lessing und die Juden. Eine Untersuchung*. 2 durchgearbeitete Aufl. Leipzig, Weicher 4 M 80
- BAUER, M., *Christian Morgensterns Leben und Werk* Vollerendet von Margarete Morgenstern und Rudolf Meyer. Munchen, Piper 5 M. 60
- BERGENTHAL, F., *Das Werk Georges. Versuch einer Wegweisung*. Breslau, Franke 1 M 50.
- BERTHEM, E., *Deutsche Gestalten. Fest- und Gedenkreiden*. Leipzig, Insel. 6 M
- BEYER-FROHLICH, M., *Hohe und Krise der Aufklarung* (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe 25, Deutsche Selbstzeugnisse, Bd 8). Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- BIE, R., *Stefan George, Richter der Zeit, Kunder des Reichs*. Berlin, Frundsberg. 1 M. 20.
- BONGS, R., *Die Wertung und Geltung Kleists zur Zeit der Romantik* (Sammlung Hertz, Reihe 10, Bd. 2) Leipzig, Strassburg, Zurich, Heitz 3 M.
- BRAND, G. K., *Werden und Wandlung Eine Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von 1880 bis heute*. Berlin, Wolff. 7 M. 60.

- BRINKMANN, H., *Anfänge des modernen Dramas in Deutschland. Versuch über die Beziehungen zwischen Drama und Bürgertum im 16. Jahrhundert.* (Jenaer germanistische Forschungen, 22.) Jena, Frommann 3 M.
- BRUGGEMANN, F., *Die Anfänge des bürgerlichen Trauerspiels in den fünfziger Jahren* (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe 14, Aufklärung, Bd 8) Leipzig, Reclam 7 M. 50.
- BURDACH, K., *Die Wissenschaft von deutscher Sprache. Ihr Werden, ihr Weg, ihre Führer* Berlin, Leipzig, de Gruyter. 5 M
- FINK, F., *Carl Ludwig Fernow, der Bibliothekar der Herzogin Anna Amalia.* Weimar, Fink. 1 M.
- Th. Fontane im Freundeskreise Berlin, Leipzig, de Gruyter. 1 M.
- FRANKEL, J., *Theodor Herzl. Des Schöpfers erstes Wollen* Wien, Fiba-Verlag. 2 M 50
- GIBELIN, J., *L'esthétique de Schelling et l'Allemagne de Mme de Staël* (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, 96). Paris, Champion. 20 fr.
- GIESE, Fr., *Nietzsche Die Erfüllung* Tübingen, Mohr. 3 M 50.
- GRAHAM, PAUL G., *The Relation of History to Drama in the Works of Friedrich Hebbel* (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, xv, 1-2) Northampton, Mass., Smith College \$1 50
- GRAUHEER, J., *August v. Haxthausen und seine Beziehungen zu Annette v. Droste-Hulshoff* Mit einem unveröffentlichten Bildnis, reichhaltigem Quellenmaterial aus dem Archiv zu Thienhausen und ungedruckten Annette-Briefen. Altena (Westf.), Selbstverlag 4 M. 20.
- GUNTHER, J., *Die Einwirkung des skandinavischen Romans auf den deutschen Naturalismus* (Nordische Studien, 14) Greifswald, Bamberg. 4 M.
- HAERTEN, H., *Vondel und der deutsche Barock* Mit Vondels Bildnis von G. Flinck und Vorwort von Dr Th. Baader. (Disquisitiones Carolinae, T. 6.) Nijmegen. 4 M
- HAUSER, O., *Die Juden und Halbjuden der deutschen Literatur.* Leipzig, Schade. 2 M. 50.
- HAUSMANN, F. W., *Aus dem Erbe Heinrich von Kleists. Eine Ausarbeitung hinterlassener Fragmente.* Hiddessen, Verlag Deutsche Worte. 3 M.
- Hegel heute. Eine Auswahl aus G. W. F. Hegels politischer Gedankenwelt. Leipzig, Meiner. 1 M. 50.
- HEISE, L., *Meine Briefe an Rainer Maria Rilke.* Berlin, Die Rabenpresse. 1 M. 50.
- HERMANN, R., *Die Bedeutung der Kirche bei Schleiermacher* (Greifswalder Univ Reden, 39) Greifswald, Bamberg 80 pf.
- HOTZEL, C., *Hanns Johst Der Weg des Dichters zum Volk* (Die deutsche Innerlichkeit). Berlin, Frunberg-Verlag. 1 M. 20
- HUCH, RICARDA, *Persönlichkeit und Werk in Darstellungen ihrer Freunde* Berlin, Atlantis 3 M. 75.
- HUOBEN, H. G., *Zinzendorfs Kirchenliederdichtung. Untersuchung über das Verhältnis von Erlebnis und Sprachform.* (Germanische Studien, 150.) Berlin, Ebering. 3 M. 60.
- IEFFERT, W., *Der junge Schiller im Weltanschauungskampf seiner Zeit.* 2. Aufl. Halle, Waisenhaus 3 M
- Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer-Gesellschaft*, 21. Heidelberg, Winter. 11 M.
- Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur.* Hg. von der Literaturarchiv-Gesellschaft in Berlin. N.F. 11. Bibliographie 1931. Berlin, Leipzig, de Gruyter. 17 M.

- KOCKJOY, W., Der deutsche Kaufmannsroman Versuch einer kultur- und geistesgeschichtlichen, genetischen Darstellung. (Der deutsche Roman in Gruppen- und Einzeldarstellungen, 1) Leipzig, Strassburg, Zurich, Heitz 5 M. 50
- KOHLER, W., Luther und das Luthertum in ihrer weltgeschichtlichen Auswirkung Leipzig, Heinsius 3 M. 60.
- KOHLMEYER, O., Peter Rosegger, der Waldschulmeister der Steiermark Bodenständige Persönlichkeitsbildung. Ein Beitrag zum Ausbau der deutschen Dichterpädagogik zur 90. Wiederkehr von Roseggers Geburtstag. Magdeburg, Lichtenberg und Buhling 3 M
- KOMMOSS, R., Sebastian Frank und Erasmus von Rotterdam (Germanische Studien, 153) Berlin, Ebering 4 M. 50
- KUTTNER, G., Wesen und Form der deutschen Schwankliteratur des 16. Jahrhunderts (Germanische Studien, 152). Berlin, Ebering. 4 M. 40.
- LACHEMANN, E., Die ersten Bücher Stefan Georges. Berlin, Bondi 3 M.
- LADEWIG, P., Dantes Vita Nova bei Goethe. Darmstadt, Ernst Ludwig Presse 2 M.
- LAUBE, H., Kritiken von Heinrich Laube (1829–1835) Ausgewählt und eingeleitet als Beitrag zur Geschichte des 'Jungen Deutschland' von S. D. Strk. (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, D 1) Breslau, Priebatsch. 4 M
- LEMBERT, L. Dietrich Eckart Ein Kunder und Kampfer des Dritten Reiches München, Eher. 60 pf
- LIEBMANN, K., Nietzsches Kampf und Untergang in Turin. Nietzsche und Mussolini (Italien in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, 8.) Leipzig, Mohring. 2 M. 40.
- LOTZ, G., 1784–1844. Aus dem literarischen Leben des Hamburger Biedermeyer. Hg. und eingel. von H. Blumenthal. Hamburg, Boysen. 6 M. 50.
- MARELLE, L., Die Schwester. Elisabeth Forster-Nietzsche. Berlin, Bischoff. 3 M.
- MERKER, P., Deutsche Idyllyendichtung, 1700–1840. Nach stilgeschichtlichen Gesichtspunkten ausgewählt (Literarhistorische Bibliothek, 12.) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt 3 M. 20
- MULLER, A., Kunstanschauung der jüngeren Romantik (Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Romantik, 12) Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50.
- MUNZ, L., Die Kunst Rembrandts und Goethes Sehen. Leipzig, Keller. 9 M.
- NEHER, W., Arnold Ruge als Politiker und politischer Schriftsteller (Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte, 64). Heidelberg, Winter. 10 M.
- NIETZSCHE, F., Werke und Briefe. Hist.-krit. Gesamtausgabe Werke, Bd. 1, Jugendschriften, 1854–1861, Bd. 2, Jugendschriften, 1861–1864, hg. von H. J. Mette. München, Beck. Each 12 M.
- OSBORN, A. R., Schleiermacher and Religious Education. London, Milford. 7s. 6d.
- PETERS, H. G., Die Ästhetik Alexander Gottlieb Baumgartens und ihre Beziehungen zum Ethischen (Neue deutsche Forschungen. Abt. Philosophie, 1). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 2 M. 40.
- PETERSEN, J., Die Sehnsucht nach dem dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung. Stuttgart, Metzler. 2 M. 60.
- PETSCH, R., Wesen und Formen der Erzählkunst. Halle, Niemeyer. 11 M.
- PONGS, H., Krieg als Volksschicksal im deutschen Schrifttum. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Gegenwart. Stuttgart, Metzler. 2 M. 85.
- PREUSS, H., Martin Luther der Deutsche. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann. 4 M. 50.

- PRICE, M. B and J M PRICE, The Publication of English Literature in Germany in the eighteenth century (University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 17) Berkeley, California \$3
- RAABE, A, Goethes Sendung im Dritten Reich Bonn, Rohrscheid 1 M. 80.
- RAUSCHENBERGER, W, Goethes Abstammung und Rassenmerkmale Leipzig, Noske 2 M 80
- REDEKER, M, Humanität, Volkstum, Christentum in der Erziehung. Ihr Wesen und gegenseitiges Verhältnis an der Gedankenwelt des jungen Herder für die Gegenwart dargestellt (Neue Forschung, 23) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt 8 M.
- RITTICH, W, Kunsttheorie, Wortkunsttheorie und lyrische Wortkunst im 'Sturm' (Deutsches Werden, 2) Greifswald, Bamberg 3 M 60
- ROSNER, F., Bitteres Leiden Oberammergauer Passionspiel. Text von 1750 Hg. von O. Mausser (Bibliothek des literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart, Publ 282) Leipzig, Hiersemann 9 M.
- RUDIGER, H, Geschichte der deutschen Sappho-Übersetzungen (Germanische Studien, 151). Berlin, Ebering 2 M. 20.
- SCHAEFER, G., Hugo von Hofmannsthal 1 Die Gestalten (Neue Forschung, 21/1) Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt 8 M
- SCHEMANN, L, Deutsche Klassiker über die Rassenfrage München, Lehmann. 1 M 50
- SCHNEIDER, T., Im Banne der Droste. Friedrichshafen, See-Verlag. 1 M. 50.
- SCHOLZ, H, Goethes Stellung zur Unsterblichkeitsfrage Tübingen, Mohr. 1 M 20.
- SCHREINERT, K, Johann Bernhard Herrmann. Briefe an Albrecht Otto und Jean Paul (aus Jean Pauls Nachlass) (Acta et commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis), xxvii, 1, xxx, 2.) Tartu (Dorpat), Kruger.
- SCHRODER, C., Der Glaube Stefan Georges in katholischer Schau (Die religiöse Entscheidung, 2) Warendorf, Schnell 1 M 20
- SOFER, J., Die Welttheater Hugo von Hofmannsthal und ihre Voraussetzungen bei Heraklit und Calderón (Vorträge und Abhandlungen der österreichischen Leogesellschaft, 37) Wien, Mayer. 1 M.
- SPENLÉ, J. E, La pensée allemande de Luther à Nietzsche. Paris, Colin 10 fr. 50
- THOMS, F., Hamanns Bekehrung (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 37, 3). Gütersloh, Bertelsmann 4 M.
- TSCHECH, J, Junge katholische Dichtung. Ein Überblick. Lobnig, Schlusche 1 M.
- VIETOR, K. (ed.), Die Briefe der Diotima (Inselbucherei, 455). Leipzig, Insel. 80 pf.
- WELLER, A, Fürst Pücklers Lebens- und Landschaftsstil. Cottbus, Heine. 1 M. 90.
- WISSMANN, E., Religionspädagogik bei Schleiermacher (4 Lfgn.). Lfg. 1 (Studien zur Geschichte des neueren Protestantismus, Bd. 15, H. 1.) Giessen, Topelmann Each 5 M
- ZABLUDOWSKI, N, Das Raumproblem in Gerhart Hauptmanns Jugenddramen (Theater und Drama, 5). Berlin, Elsner Verlagsges. 3 M
- ZINECKER, R., Deutsche Großstadtdielyrik (1910-1930) Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Expressionismus 1910-1914. Hg mit Unterstützung des Ministeriums für Schulwesen und Volkskultur. Prag, Deutscher Verein zur Verbreitung gemeinnütziger Kenntnisse. 6 Kč

THE YORK BAKERS' PLAY OF  
THE LAST SUPPER

IN the preface to her *York Plays* Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith writes: 'We might have found much illustrative matter in the compotus rolls or account books of the various companies (of York), but unfortunately very few of these are preserved. The Book of the Pewterers, 1599, and the Innholders' Ordinary, 1608, do not refer to the (Corpus Christi) play. The Bakers' Accounts from 1584 down to 1836 have, however, been rescued'.<sup>1</sup>

Apparently the earlier—and more important—volume of the Bakers' Accounts, now in the British Museum (Add. MS. 33852), eluded Miss Toulmin Smith; and, so far as I am aware, no excerpts from this manuscript have yet been published. In view of the scarcity of early craft accounts in the great dramatic cycle towns, any continuous series over a period of years is of value for the student of mediæval drama. These accounts are contained in a folio volume, 69 ff., imperfect at the beginning and with many worn or mutilated pages. They extend from 1543 to 1580, followed by some other undated, probably later, entries. There is a gap in the accounts from September 1557 to October 1563; the 1547 account seems either to have been omitted or merged with that of 1548;<sup>2</sup> the 1552 account is misplaced, and there is some haphazardness both in the method of dating the accounts, and, apparently, in the actual date of rendering.

From an early date the bakers of York seem to have taken an active and independent line in regard to their Corpus Christi pageant. In 1387, according to the Memorandum Book, Johannes de Duffeld, Johannes de Calton, and Robertus de Malton, representatives of the skinnners, *bakers*, and dyers, attacked Robertus de Waghen, because he had failed to fulfil his contract to maintain in good repair the house in Toft Green where the pageants were kept.<sup>3</sup> Two undated, possibly earlier, entries in the Memo-

<sup>1</sup> *York Plays*, Oxford, 1885, p. xxxv. Miss Smith adds in a footnote, 'I was told that an old compotus roll of the Mercers' Company still exists, but I have been unable to get a sight of it'. This 'old compotus roll' was probably one of those used by Miss Maud Sellers in *The York Mercers and Merchant Adventurers 1356-1917*—rolls which are rich in illustrative matter for the Mercers' pageant of Doomsday.

<sup>2</sup> *Infra*, p. 148 n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> The *York Memorandum Book*, II, 1388-1493, Surtees Society, No. 125, pp. 31-2.



randum Book testify to the bakers' shrewd means of raising funds for the play through the misdemeanours of fellow-craftsmen:

Item ordeigne est et establi par commune assent des pestours Deverwyk que nul de lour artifice desore en avaut vend nul roundel ne escu de . . . payn de matyne a nul regratir de payn pur mettre a vent, sur peyne de demy marc apaiser, ent xld a la chaumbre et xld a la paygne des ditz pestours de Corpore Christi

Item, que null pestour vend aucun roundell ne escu ne chunz de payn demayne a null regratier de payn pur mettre a vent, sur payn de dymy marce a payer, ont xld a la chambre et xld. a la pagyn de ditz pestours de Corpus Christi.<sup>1</sup>

From Roger Burton the town clerk's 1415 *Ordo paginarum ludr Corporis Christi* we first learn the subject of the pageant:

Bakers—*Agnus paschalis, Cena Domini, xij apostoli, Jesus prociunctus lintheo lavans pedes eorum institutio sacramenti corporis Christi in noua lege, communio apostolorum.*<sup>2</sup>

'Waterleaders' is added after 'Bakers' in a later hand.<sup>3</sup> In another list of the plays and crafts, undated<sup>4</sup> but also signed by Burton,<sup>5</sup> and therefore within the term of his twenty-one years' town clerkship (1415–36),<sup>6</sup> this play is divided into two:

Bakers	31. <i>Cena Christi cum discipulis</i>
Waterleaders	32. <i>Lavacio pedum apostolorum.</i> <sup>7</sup>

In the Register of the play, dated emphatically by Dr W. W. Greg<sup>8</sup> as not earlier than the middle of the second half of the fifteenth century, the episodes are again united and credited to the bakers alone—the waterleaders combining with the cooks in the Second Accusation before Pilate, the Remorse of Judas, and the Purchase of the Field of Blood. But the association of the crafts—at least financially—was apparently resumed at a later date; for in the bakers' sixteenth-century accounts fairly regular contributions from the waterleaders (or burnleaders) to the pageant money are recorded over a period of years (1544, 1545, 1546, 1548?, 1549, 1551, 1553, 1554, 1555, 1556).<sup>9</sup> The sandleaders, bowlbakers, and foreigners also contribute, less frequently, during this period.

Either independently, then, or with the help of other crafts, the bakers seem to have shouldered loyally their responsibility for their pageant. So

<sup>1</sup> *The York Memorandum Book*, I, 1376–1419, Surtees Society, No. 120, pp. 29, 169.

<sup>2</sup> *York Plays*, p. xxiii.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xxiii, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Davies, *Extracts from the Municipal Records of the City of York during the Reigns of Edward IV, Edward V, and Richard III*, London, 1843, p. 233, says 'of a few years later date', that is, later than 1415, but gives no authority.

<sup>5</sup> *York Plays*, p. xviii.

<sup>6</sup> R. H. Skaife, *M.S. Catalogue of the Mayors and Barliffs . . . and Town Clerks of the City of York*, 1895, p. 29.

<sup>7</sup> Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

<sup>8</sup> *Bibliographical and Textual Problems of the English Miracle Cycles*, London, 1914, p. 28 n. The editor of the *York Plays* had dated the Register as 1430–40.

<sup>9</sup> Add. MS. 33852, ff. 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 12b, 16b, 20, 21.

far as available evidence goes,<sup>1</sup> there is no sign of concerted restiveness or resentment on the part of the 'occupation' either before or during our period. In 1554, it is true, the City Chamberlain's Book reveals the following instances of non-compliance:

Serchers of the bakers *presentis* Nycholes haxope bakers for that he wold not attend vppon ther paygiant vppon Corpuserysty Day beyng warnyd by the Serchers and also for dyssobayng the Serchers & hole occupacon xxd.  
 ponitur Serchers of the Bakers *presentis* John hartlay Baker for that he came not ad to attend vppon ther paygiant before my Lorde Maio<sup>r</sup> at the Comon arbitrem Hall / ponitur ad arbitrandum <sup>2</sup>

But these rare individual cases merely accentuate the normal co-operation of the craft. When our volume of accounts opens in 1543, we find the bakers actively participating in the Corpus Christi play:

Item payd for reperacons Abowte our pagen	xxjd.
Item payd for payntyng of our dyodyms	xvj d.
Item spent thr(ed)	ij d.
Item payd for torches	xijs. vjd.
Item payd for playing of our pagend	xs. vijd.
Item spend for our suppers At the paying there of	xijd. <sup>3</sup>

Up to the end of the Marian period, plague years excepted, the Corpus Christi plays continued without serious challenge. In 1548<sup>4</sup> (and the order was confirmed in 1549), three<sup>5</sup> ultra-Catholic plays, the Dying, Assumption, and Coronation of our Lady, were expunged from the acted cycle. But the innocuous play of the Last Supper escaped the censor's ban; and the bakers' steady co-operation can be traced in their accounts through the recurring principal item (cited below) of 10s. 8d. for their pageant. Once in 1545 the Corpus Christi cycle was threatened by the regular decennial performance of the Creed Play. On March 17 of that year it was agreed by the Town Council 'that my lorde Mayour shall call before hym the master of Corpuseriste gyld and to take an order as towchyng playng of the creyde play as he shall thynke good for the mooste proffett & aduantage of the sayd Cetie'.<sup>6</sup> But the Bakers' Accounts seem to

<sup>1</sup> For the period prior to the opening of the Bakers' Accounts in 1543, I am largely dependent on the valuable published research of Robert Davies and Miss Maud Sellers. For the period contemporary with these accounts, I have independently examined the manuscript House Books, Chamberlain's Books and Chamberlain's Rolls, in the City archives at York, and draw on my own transcripts where necessary to supplement or amend Davies, or, as very frequently, to supply the exact documentation which Davies omits.

<sup>2</sup> MS. Chamberlain's Book, vol. iv, pp. 73, 74.

<sup>3</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 3b.

<sup>4</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xix, f. 16b; Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

<sup>5</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xix, f. 69b.

<sup>6</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xvii, f. 84; Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

testify to the regular performance of the craft pageants, and the Creed Play is no more.

1544	In <i>primis</i> payd ffor playng off howre pagand	xs viij d. <sup>1</sup>
1545	In <i>primis</i> payd to ( ) plaer for playing off the pagand	xs viij d. <sup>2</sup>
1546	Item for playng of the pagent	xs. (viij d.) <sup>3</sup>
1548?	In <i>primis</i> payd to the plaer ffor playng off the pagand	xs v(iij d.) <sup>4</sup>
1549	Item payd ffor playng off the pagand	xs. viij d. <sup>5</sup>
1550	Item payd to John huntynghon ffor hys payns takyng ffor his plaers	xij d. <sup>6</sup>
1551	Item payd to the player ffor playng off the pagand	xs. v(iij d.) <sup>7</sup>
1552 <sup>8</sup>		
1553	Item payd to the plaer ffor playng off the pagand	xs. viij d. <sup>9</sup>
1554	Item received of our brether for padgemony xiijs vjd whereof to John huntington	xs viij d. <sup>10</sup>
1555	Item payd to the plaer off oure pagand	xs. viij d. <sup>11</sup>
1556	Item payd to the plaers ffor playing off the pagand	xs viij d. <sup>12</sup>
1557	Item payd to the plaer ffor playng	xs. viij d. <sup>13</sup>

In five of these thirteen years from 1543 during which the bakers contributed to the Corpus Christi play, the payment is made to a single

<sup>1</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 5b.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 6b.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 8. The page is mutilated and the regnal year is lacking, but the account follows straight on after the last one and is dated 'for the yere beyng that is to say the ( ) kyng henry the viijth', and must therefore be for the 38th (and last) year of the reign of Henry VIII, who died in January 1547. That 1546 was a play year appears from the MS. House Book, vol. xviii, f. 15b. April 12, 1546 'Item it is agreyd by the said persons that corpus cristie play shalbe playd this yere and that the billottis shalbe delueryd furth for the same according to the auncient custome'.

<sup>4</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 9. The heading of this account is 'Edo vj<sup>o</sup> Anno ij<sup>o</sup> die men sis (sic) Augusti'. There is a small hole in the paper after 'Anno'. Probably 'ij<sup>o</sup>' is the regnal year and the day of the month is omitted, for there is no mention of plays in 1547, the first year of Edward VI. 1548, on the other hand, we know to have been a play year, the year in which the three plays were first removed from the cycle (*supra*, p. 147).

<sup>5</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 10. This was the year in which the confirmation of the order regarding the three vetoed plays was made (*supra*, p. 147).

<sup>6</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 11. The meagreness of the gratuity was probably due to the cancelling of the play on account of the plague. Under May 8, 1550, I note a minute to the effect that foreign butchers shall resort to the city daily with flesh to sell and wholly without any paying of pageant money or other impositions considering that is for the refuge and help of this city during the time that the said city is infected with the plague (MS. House Book, vol. xx, f. 14).

<sup>7</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 12. In the MS. House Book, vol. xx, f. 50, March 23, 1551, it was agreed 'that the billettis shalbe mayd and delueryd for the playng of Corpuscristy play'.

<sup>8</sup> Plague year. On April 1 the usual order was made for the billets for playing of Corpus Christi play (MS. House Book, vol. xx, f. 99), but on June 9 an order in regard to the sheriff's riding was made 'for soo much as this yere there is no playe on Corpus xpi daye'. And further there will be no riding at midsummer and St Peter's Eve 'bycause the sykenesse is nowe dangerouse in this Citie' (MS. House Book, vol. xx, f. 105).

<sup>9</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 13b. MS. House Book, vol. xxi, f. F. Order for billets for Corpus Christi play.

<sup>10</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 16. MS. House Book, vol. xxi, f. 31. Order for the billets. '... And that theis pagantys that of Late were Left forth shall be played ayeine as beforetyme they were at the chardgis of theym that were wont to bryng theym forth.' Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

<sup>11</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 20. MS. House Book, vol. xxi, f. 85. Order for the billets for Corpus Christi play.

<sup>12</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 21. MS. House Book, vol. xxii, f. 5, March 3, 1556: Order for billets for Corpus Christi play.

<sup>13</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 22. MS. House Book, vol. xxii, f. 53 b, March 15, 1557: Order for billets.

player; once, possibly twice, definitely to John Huntington; three times simply 'for playing'; and once only 'to the plaers'; which leads one to wonder whether, as in the case of Thomas Colclow, skinner, in the Coventry smiths' play,<sup>1</sup> the direction and providing of the players 'and all that longeth thereto' were placed in the hands of a certain individual distinct from the pageant master. This possibility would seem to find confirmation in the following additional entries:

1544	(Item) payd yat Nyght yat we payd the plaer	viiij d.
1545	Item payd at owre Soper yat nyght yat we payd the player	viiij d. <sup>2</sup>

Between September 1557 and October 1563 there is a gap in the accounts, but presumably the bakers produced their pageant when required. From a minute of March 16, 1558, we know the decision of the Council that the play of Corpus Christi 'be spared and leaft of playeng the tyme instant beyng bothe trowblouse with warres and also contagiouse with sykenesse'.<sup>3</sup> From subsequent minutes in April and May of that year, we see that they agreed that 'John Branthwate Master of St Antonys and his keepers shall ffurthwith provyd for the playng of ane play callyd the Pater noster play' this year on Corpus Christi day, the banes to be proclaimed on St George's Day and Whitmonday,<sup>4</sup> and the charges to be borne from half the pageant money raised by the crafts,<sup>5</sup> a sum which was evidently insufficient so that a second levy was decreed by the mayor.<sup>6</sup> In 1559 the City Chamberlain laconically set down the expenses on Corpus Christi day as nil.<sup>7</sup> On March 27, 1561, the play was ordered to be played with the exception of the suspect plays of the Dying, Assumption, and Coronation of our Lady,<sup>8</sup> which had been restored to the canon in 1554;<sup>9</sup> a sum of 34s. was received for 'leases of places to heare Corpus xpi play'; and £10 0s. 8d. expense was incurred on behalf of the Mayor, Aldermen and Council, who heard Corpus Christi play at the Common Hall Gates.<sup>10</sup> In 1562, after some dallying with the idea of changing the date of the play to 'St Barnaby day' (June 11), 'And thystories of the old & new testament or ellis the crede play if apoun examinacione it may be shalbe played',<sup>11</sup> it was agreed that Corpus Christi play should be played

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Sharp, *On the pageants or dramatic mysteries anciently performed at Coventry*, Coventry, 1825, p. 15. See, also, *The York Mercers*, p. 58, February 1453/4, where a contract for £10 was made with Robert Hewyk, parish clerk, Leeds, Thomas Fitt, tapiter, and Henry Clayton, weaver, 'de et super educacione ludu Corporis Christi, videlicet Domysday'.

<sup>2</sup> Add. MS. 33852, ff. 5b, 6b.

<sup>3</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxii, f. 120, Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

<sup>4</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxii, ff. 125b, 127; Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

<sup>5</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxii, f. 127.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. xxii, f. 129b.

<sup>7</sup> MS. Chamberlain's Book, vol. v, f. 67b.

<sup>8</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxiii, f. 10.

<sup>9</sup> *Supra*, p. 148 n. 10.

<sup>10</sup> MS. Chamberlain's Roll, 1561.

<sup>11</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxiii, f. 49b, Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 266 n.

on the accustomed day, namely Corpus Christi day.<sup>1</sup> In 1563 the play was arranged for as usual by the Town Council.<sup>2</sup>

For the next few years, 1564, 1565,<sup>3</sup> 1566, there is no record of any dramatic activity in the city, the Bakers' Accounts, which begin again in 1564, recording merely expenses of upkeep for the pageant or the usual 'reckoning' dinner.

On three occasions only after this, 1567, 1569, 158-, have we any evidence that the bakers gave their play of the Last Supper, and, by then, to judge from the sparse expenditure, the play was shorn of its glory. In 1567 the Council agreed to the playing of Corpus Christi play and the issuing of billets;<sup>4</sup> and the Bakers' Accounts modestly record-

Item for the players supper	1js.
Item for ale that night	1js vjd <sup>5</sup>

In February 1568 the Council decided to have the Creed play, then on March 30 cancelled that order and agreed to have no play that year; and finally, on April 27, side-tracked the commoners' desire to have the Corpus Christi play by agreeing that 'the booke thereof shuld be perused and otherwise amendyd before it were played'.<sup>6</sup> On March 17, 1569, it was agreed that Corpus Christi play be played on Tuesday in Whitsun week,<sup>7</sup> and the Bakers' Book again records an expenditure of 2s. 4d. 'for our players suppers' and 4d. for a gallon of ale,<sup>8</sup> in addition to a few minor expenses which will be noted in another connexion. The next record of dramatic activity in the city is in 1572, when the Pater Noster play was substituted.<sup>9</sup> The pageant money seems to have been collected as usual by the crafts and handed over to the City Chamberlain; but otherwise the bakers' financial responsibility was slight.

Item to John wylliamson for Lokyng abowte the paygant Gear	vjd.
Item to the putters of the paygant in bread and ale	vd.
Item in ale whan we went to se the paygant	vjd.
Item for a sheyld of maynbread to carry to my Lorde Mayour	xjd.
Item to the Chambre for our paygant money	xjs. <sup>10</sup>

Again some years pass with no evidence of performances. In the follow-

<sup>1</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxiii, f. 50.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 93, Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

<sup>3</sup> MS. Chamberlain's Book, vol. v, p. 47, 1565. 'Leasez of places to here Corpus crysty play, Summa nichil'; p. 126, 'Expences of Corpus xpi day this yere' (*blank*).

<sup>4</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxiv, f. 69b.

<sup>5</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 28.

<sup>6</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxiv, ff. 104b, 106b, 106a, 108b; Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 267-9.

<sup>7</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxiv, f. 130, Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

<sup>8</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 34.

<sup>9</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxv, ff. 6, 12b, 15, 19; Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-1.

<sup>10</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 37b.

ing entry, penned by the Chamberlain of York in 1577, one detects a note of regret for the loss of good revenue to the City.

Leases of places to heare the playe	Item as for any suche leases receyved this yere	<i>nil</i> . <sup>1</sup>
--	--	---------------------------

After the Pater Noster play in 1572 the Archbishop of York had asked for the copy of the play books and had apparently imposed a strict dramatic censorship.<sup>2</sup> In 1575 a deputation was appointed by the Town Council to wait on the Archbishop and 'requur...all suche y<sup>e</sup> play bookis as perteyne this Cittie no<sup>w</sup> in his gracis custodie' and to suggest the appointment of some learned men to correct the same 'wherein by the lawe of this Realme they ar to be reformed', and, if possible, this to be done before Lammas.<sup>3</sup> In 1578 it was agreed by the Council that Corpus Christi play should be played that year and that the book should first be submitted to the Archbishop and Dean for inspection.<sup>4</sup> Nothing more was heard of the matter. In 1580 a final attempt was made by the Commons who did 'earnestly request' that Corpus Christi play might be played this year, whereupon My Lord Mayor answered 'that he and his brethern wold considr of their request'.<sup>5</sup> From the City archives no evidence of favourable consideration of this last effort to revive the traditional play is forthcoming; but in an undated account which follows the 1580 account in the Bakers' Book, the following items would seem to point to one more performance:

Item pad for playars souppers	ijs. iiijd.
Item pad for mayne bread	vijd.
Item for makyng & payntyng the dyodemes	ijs.
Item pad for one gallon of ayll	iiijd. <sup>6</sup>

If, as suggested above,<sup>7</sup> in the pre-Elizabethan heyday the production of the pageant was handed over to a 'plaer' every year, who, for the lump sum of 10s. 8d, supervised the rehearsals, provided the actors' robes and paid their fees, that fact may explain the consistent drabness of the York Bakers' Accounts. Plays of the Last Supper survive in the texts of the Towneley cycle, the Chester cycle, the Ludus Coventriae, and are conjectured to have formed part of the Newcastle and Coventry cycles; and the title is found in the list of the thirty-six plays of the lost Beverley cycle. But unfortunately in none of these cases do we have the corresponding craft accounts for comparative purposes. According to the York

<sup>1</sup> MS. Chamberlain's Roll, No. 7.

<sup>2</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxv, f. 19, Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 270-1.

<sup>3</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxvi, f. 27, Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxvii, f. 151, Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

<sup>5</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxvii, f. 219, Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

<sup>6</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 66.

<sup>7</sup> *Supra*, p. 149.

Register, the play required seven actors: Jesus, Marcellus, Andreas, Petrus, Jacobus, Judas, Thomas.<sup>1</sup> With the exception of the diadems,<sup>2</sup> no dress expenses are entered—unless perchance a gown brought from London by John Langton in 1554 was destined for use in the pageant.<sup>3</sup> The play of the Last Supper demanded, it is true, less elaborate properties than some of the plays—no hell-mouth, no 'machines', merely simple utensils such as any honest craftsman's household could furnish at need. As the text now stands in the Register, the following episodes are included: the Paschal feast; the footwashing; the quarrel as to leadership after the departure of Christ; the example of the little child; the accusation of betrayal and departure of Judas, the prophecy of Peter's denial; 'I am the shepherd, ye are the sheep', the command to have swords.<sup>4</sup> The properties actually mentioned in the text are:

the paschal lamb

Oure lambe is roste and redy dight (l. 8)  
My selfe schall parte itt zou be-twene (l. 20)

towel and water

Do us have watir here in hast (l. 40)  
And here a towell clene to taste (l. 42)

swords

Maistir, we haue here swordis twoo (l. 176)

and presumably would also comprise a table (the Towneley *mensam*)<sup>5</sup> and a basin (the Towneley *peluim*<sup>6</sup>). After l. 89 in the York Register a leaf (R 1j) is lost. It is clear that the missing leaf must have contained the sop episode, for the next lines after the gap run:

*Quod facis fac cicius*  
pat pou shall do, do sone.

The Towneley stage direction reads: '*Tunc comedent, & Iudas porrigit manum in discum cum Ihesu*'.<sup>7</sup> However bare the York table appointments, a dish for the sop must have been among the regular equipment.<sup>8</sup>

Actually in the accounts only one of these properties, the paschal lamb, can be traced, in addition to the diadems already mentioned.

1553 Item ffor mendyng the lam & payntyng off the dyadens ( )<sup>9</sup>  
1557 Item payd ffor iij dyadems & the lam mendyng xij d.<sup>10</sup>

Elsewhere the diadems figure ingloriously alone. 1543, 'for payntyng of our dyodyms xvj d.'; <sup>11</sup> 1569, 'for Makyng and payntyng of our dyodemes ijs.'; <sup>12</sup> and the similar item already quoted above in the final undated account.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *York Plays*, p. 233

<sup>2</sup> Add. MS 33852, f. 16

<sup>3</sup> *The Towneley Plays*, E E T.S., E S. No LXXI, 1897, p. 215.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 216.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the representation of the Last Supper in Grace Frank, 'Popular Iconography of the Passion', *P.M.L.A.*, June 1931.

<sup>6</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 13.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 3b.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 34.

<sup>9</sup> *Infra*, p. 152.

<sup>10</sup> *York Plays*, pp 233-9.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 215.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 215

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid*, f. 22.

<sup>14</sup> *Supra*, p. 151.

Torches, in some years, monopolise a large share of the budget:

1543	Item payd for torches	xiijs.	vjd.
1544	Item payd ffor one torch toppyng	iijs.	vjd.
1557	Item payd to Jamys best ffor toppyng off the torcheyes	xvs	
	Item payd ffor torchys beryng		xijd. <sup>1</sup>

but these were probably for processional rather than for stage purposes. At first there seems to be some possibility in the regularly recurring Corpus Christi day item ranging from 8*d.* (the more usual amount) to 12*d.* for a shield, occasionally two shields. But any excuse for more picturesque interpretation of this item is debarred by such entries as that in 1567 of 8*d.* for a 'sheld of mayne bread'; in 1569, of 12*d.* for 'two sheylds to my Lorde maiour'; in 1572, of 12*d.* for 'a sheyld of maynbread to carry to my Lorde Mayour';<sup>2</sup> or by an entry in the Chamberlain's accounts recording a payment of 8*d.* to the bakers for the present of a 'cheyld of maynebred'.<sup>3</sup>

The craft seems to have reserved to itself the duty of catering. In addition to the suppers already noted, the following provision was made for meals and ale for the actors on Trinity Sunday and Corpus Christi day in play years:

1549	Item payd to the players ffor thare soperd & dener off trenete son-day & corpus xpi day		xiiijd.
1551	Item spent off the players off corpus xpi day at dynner		xvd.
	Item spent at Robert herressone at his pagand In wyne		xvjd.
1553	Item payd ffor the players dynners off corpus xpi day		xvjd.
1554	Item paid of corpus xpi's daie ffor dynner to the plaiers at John huntingtons		xvjd.
1555	Item payd ffor the players dynners off corpus xpi day		xxd.
1556	Item payd ffor the plaers dynners off corpus xpi day	ijjs.	
	Item payd ffor a galon off ayll to the plaers		iiijd.
1557	Item payd ffor the plaers brakfaste one corpus xpi day	ijjs.	
	Item payd ffor ij galone off ayll one corpus xpi ewyn & one day		xijd. <sup>4</sup>

'Reckoning' dinners too had to be provided for the two pageant masters.

1544	Item payd at cudbart at the rekynyng dynner off owre pagand masters	js.	( )
1545	Item payd at master lang(tou)ns yat day yat 3e had yowre Rekynyng deyner off ( ) (pag)and mastes (sic)	ijjs.	
1565	Item at laus cowpland when the padgyan dynner was mayd	ijjs.	vjd.
1573	Item paid for a pottell of wyne at our paygant maisters Reckonyng dynner		viijd.
1574	Item paid for wyne at william kyngis paygant dyner		xxd. <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Add. MS. 33852, ff. 3b, 5b, 22

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 28, 34, 37b.

<sup>3</sup> MS. Chamberlain's Book, vol. iv, f. 88.

<sup>4</sup> Add. MS. 33852, ff. 10, 12, 12b, 13b, 19b, 20, 21, 22. Various other small undefined expenditures may concern refreshments in connexion with the Corpus Christi play (ff. 5b, 12, 19b, 21). A 1548 (?) payment of 12*d.* 'at master boyslays for appyls & wyne' was in all probability for the players.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 5b, 6b, 25b, 39, 41. I have some difficulty with the entry in the 1576 account (f. 47) regarding 12*d.* paid at Wm Hewetson's by consent of the company in making of reckoning for wine 'that we had fectche (?) by the paygant maisters', but, in any case, it was 'not allowed'.



The responsibility of the pageant masters for the pageant money seemed to continue in play year and no-play year alike; and that with the falling of the Corpus Christi play on evil days, their duties became distasteful as well as onerous may be deduced from the following minute in the Bakers' Book:

Also it is fullye concluded and agreed by the Sceachers (*sic*) *whiche* is John Crough-ton Robert nicolson & George Wilson thelder and the brethern assembled in the comon place of the vij<sup>th</sup> of may *anno domini* 1577 that at all tymes and tymes hereafter that no maister of fre baykers of the sytie of yorke shall haue no mo prentissess but one *whiche* haue<sup>1</sup> be padgone maisters And euery younge man newlye sett vpp in the said occupacon *whiche* haue not bene padione *master* shall haue no prentas vnto suche tyme as they haue bene padione *master* or ells shall pay to the vse of the said occupacon xxs for tayking the sam prentis.<sup>2</sup>

It is not always easy to keep separate the expenses for repairs to the pageant house and pageant car which figure so frequently in the accounts, ranging from a few pence in some years to several pounds in others For the pageant house are payments for such items as timber, lime, sand, nails, stones, boards for the door, bands, locks and keys, as well as fees for workmanship to wrights, locksmiths and tilers. In 1549 the sum of 19s 8d. was raised from the whole craft by special levy and expended on 'mending off the pagand hows', an additional 6s. 6d. being paid for workmanship and materials.<sup>3</sup> Extensive repairs, amounting to the large sum of £3. 4s. 4d., were made as late as 1574; and I cite the account *in extenso*:

Reperacions of	In pramis paid for iij pecis of Tymbre that was boght	
our paygant	of Nycholas Clerck	vs. viijd.
howse	Item for one pece of Tymbre boght of Richard Clerk	ijs. iiijd.
	Item for xv sparres	vjs. vjd.
	Item for one easbourd	xd.
	Item for ij hundreth of sex penny nales	xijd.
	Item for half a hundreth doble spykyngis	ijd.
	Item for half a hundreth of Latt nales	jd.
	Item for ij gallons of ale and one Lof of Bread	xjd.
	Item payd to the Smyth for opnyng of the Marchant's	
	paygant howse dowre	jd.
	Item payd for ij stickes of sex kyddis to make pynes	vjd.
	Item for buyldyng of our paygant howse	vjs.
	Item for iij quarters of Lym and for the carrage of yt	vjs.
	Item for half a quarter of plaster	xxd.
	Item for a hundreth of breke	xijd.
	Item for carraige of the same	ijd.
	Item for ij thowsand of Latt nales	ijs. iiijd.
	Item for vij bounshe (?) of Lattis	ijs. xd.
	Item for xx <sup>th</sup> Lodd of earthe	xxd.
	Item for x Loodd of sand	xd.
	Item for ij penny worthe of sex penny nales and ij	
	great brages bought after ward	iiijd.

<sup>1</sup> not probably omitted after *haue*.

<sup>2</sup> Add. MS 33852, f. 10.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 64.

Item for cearten stones whiche was bought for the ground walles and for the carrage of the stones	ijs.	xd.
Item for eight Ryge Tyle		xvj d
Item to the Tyllers for thekyng of the sayd howse	ixs.	jd.
Item for drynke that was bestowed vpon the Tyllers		xij d
Item for those days when the paygant Maisters were at the paygant howse		xxij d.
Item to the wryght for takyng downe of the paygant howse		xij d.
Item to the tyller for takyng <sup>1</sup> of the teyle		vij d.
Item for ij bordis for the paygant howse dowre		xij d.
Item for croukes & a band to the same dore		iiij d.
Item to the workmen for Rychard Clarke		iiij d
Summa	iiijl. iijs. iiij d. <sup>2</sup>	

The bakers paid to the city a yearly rent of 12*d.* for the house,<sup>3</sup> which they sublet to other crafts for their pageant cars—to the bowyers and weavers, who each over a period of some years paid an annual rent of 12*d.*, and to the painters (and pinners), who, after 1564, paid 1*s.* 4*d.*<sup>4</sup> In 1579 the following decree appears among the accounts:

Those that haue the padione howse to paye ijs. vjd. for the rentt to the searchers and to the occupacon yearleie at the feaste sanct martin and at the feast of penthecoste Rychard yatts will geue the same graunte in the comen plaice the xiiij october anno 1579.<sup>5</sup>

There is much expenditure on the pageant car—mainly on the wheels, for oiling, repairing, or renewing.

1544 Item payd ffor Nallis to the pagand & the qwelys		iiij d.
1545 Item payd ffor mendyng off the pagand & the qwelys and a new strake to the quell & nalis to the qwelys	ijs.	
1548? Item payd to John masson (?) wryght ffor mendyng off the pagand		iiij d.
1549 Item payd ffor qwre quell nallis & mendyng of the pagand		vij d.
1551 Item payd ffor mendyng off the pagand & the qwelys	vs. ( )	
Item spen ffor ij days goyng abowt to the reperaciione & thyngis qwychc longyd to the pagand	ijs.	

<sup>1</sup> *downe* deleted after *takyng*

<sup>2</sup> Add MS 33852, f 40*b* Other repairs to the house cost: in 1545, 3*s.* (f. 6*b*); in 1553, 13*s.* 7*d.* plus an obliterated sum for lime, sand, and bearing of it (f. 13); in 1564, 2*s.* 2*d.* (f. 23*b*), in 1569, 2*s.* (f. 34), in 1570, 1*s.* 10*d.* (f. 35*b*), in 1573, 1*s.* 10*d.* (f. 39). In 1574, 2*s.* 4*d.* is recovered from the sale of stone and lime left at the pageant house.

<sup>3</sup> I note this entry regularly every year from 1543–80, except in 1543, 1548 (?), where the amount is obliterated, 1546, where it is probably covered by an untemised entry for 'many and dyuers necessary expens', and in 1554 and 1570, where it is unrecorded. In 1578 an additional payment of 5*d.* is made.

<sup>4</sup> Payments for house-ferm or pageant room were made as follows 1544, by bowyers and weavers (amount obliterated); 1545, by bowyers 12*d.* (?) and weavers (amount obliterated), 1546, by bowyers 12*d.* (?) and weavers 12*d.*; 1548 (?), by bowyers 12*d.*, weavers 12*d.*, 1550, 'the wevers payd nothyng ffor ffor (*sic*) thare pagane standyng thys yere'; but in 1551, weavers 2*s.*; 1553, weavers 12*d.*; 1555, 'for ij pagand ffarne' 1*s.* 4*d.*, 1556, 'for ij pagands standing in the pagand hows xv ( )'. From 1564–70 there is a regularly recurring payment of 1*s.* 4*d.* from the painters for house-ferm; in 1571 from the pinners; in 1573 from the painters, from 1574–80 from the painters and pinners, and, in the final undated account, from the painters. In 1578 additional payments were made by John Gryme and Richard Siddell; in 1579 by Siddell; in 1580 by Thomas Londell.

<sup>5</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 56*b*.

# 156 *The York Bakers' Play of the Last Supper*

1552	Item payed to John wylson to paye for our pare of whelles Item delyuerd to the sayd John to the same vse the xixth day of June	vij s.  xxd.
1553	Item In primis ffor apayre ( <i>sic</i> ) off New qwels Item ffor Nalls & clottis Item ffor byndyng off the qwhelis & a strake & warkmaschyp Item beylls & nalls	vij s. xviij d. xviij d. iiij d.
1555	Item payd ffor dowlyng off the pagand qwellys and other things a bowt it	iiij s. viij d.
1556	Item payd ffor the qwels mendyng <sup>1</sup> pagand	xij d. ?
1557	Item payd ffor huppis to the qwels	vj d. <sup>2</sup>

But for all this talk of wheels, our accounts refuse to commit themselves beyond a pair at a time; so that a four-wheeled vehicle suitable for resting at the various 'stations' is a matter of conjecture, not of proof. There is no mention of the horses which Sharp finds in connexion with the Coventry smiths' and drapers' plays.<sup>3</sup> The car was probably drawn through the streets by a detachment of craftsmen. In 1572, in connexion with the Pater Noster play, we find this item:

Item to the putters of the pagyant in bread and ale v d.<sup>4</sup>

Otherwise our volume of accounts maintains a rigid indifference to the curiosity of posterity. It is somewhat ironic that the most valuable scraps of information regarding the pageant car—that typical English Corpus Christi vehicle—come in a later volume of accounts when the Corpus Christi play is derelict. On June 3, 1584, one Mr Thomas Grafton, schoolmaster, presented a supplication to the Town Council 'wherby he desireth that for the furtherance of midsomer shewe, he may be licensed to set forth certane compiled speaches and also to haue one pageant frame for that purpose . . .'<sup>5</sup> A 'pageant frame' was apparently hired from the bakers for the occasion and the costs of its equipment and conveyance charged to the town.

Item paid to iij <sup>or</sup> Laborers for puttinge forth & in the pagiantis into the houses at vj d. a pece	ij s.
Item to the bakers for ther chardgis of there pagiant	ij s. xd <sup>6</sup>

The second volume of Bakers' Accounts adds some detail:

Item for ij <sup>o</sup> Iron lamps for the padgion	ij d.
Item for byrkis and Resshes to the padgion	ij d.
Item for ij <sup>o</sup> gallands of ayle	vij d.

<sup>1</sup> and bote to the deleted after mendyng.

<sup>2</sup> Add. MS. 33852, ff. 5b, 6b, 9b, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20, 21, 22.

<sup>3</sup> Sharp, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Add. MS. 33852, f. 37b. The entry in 1549, f. 10b: 'Item spent yat day yat we put in the pagand and and (*sic*) mayd ffast the dorys viij d.', adds nothing.

<sup>5</sup> MS. House Book, vol. xxviii, f. 143.

<sup>6</sup> MS. Chamberlain's Book, vol. vi, f. 70. A second pageant was probably lent by the skynners, for the same account contains the item: 'Item paid to the skynners that they disbursed aboute serten charges of ther pagiant iij s. viij d.', and there are payments for undefined charges to other crafts, as well as for repairs to the pageants.

Item to the labores (*sic*) for takinge the clothes vp and doune and nayles iij d.  
 Item to vj laborers for puttinge the padgione ijs.<sup>1</sup>

With heavy overhead charges for the upkeep of the pageant house and car and their inspection,<sup>2</sup> in addition to considerable outlay in play years, the bakers' pageant can have been no very paying proposition. The average receipts from the craft's own pageant money, where extant and legible in the accounts up to 1557, range from 14s. to 16s. 6d.<sup>3</sup>, of which, roughly, 1s. in some years went in 'gathering expenses'.<sup>4</sup> In some of the later years these receipts dwindle sadly away: in 1565 to 1s. 4d., in 1567 to 4s. 7d., and in 1569 to 4s. In 1572, the Pater Noster year, however, sums of 7s. 2d. and 12s. are recorded, and, in 1574, at two sundry times, 28s. 10d. Individual contributions are only occasionally mentioned: in 1571, 'of vxorburnleder for pagannt money vj d.', 'of vxor Thomson for paggeannt money ijd.', in 1575, from Thomas Lonsdaylle and John Ryché 6d. each.<sup>5</sup> The contributions from other crafts are more difficult to determine, but probably in no year added more than some seven or eight shillings to the revenue.

In the very imperfect state of the manuscript, exact statistics are impossible, but I give below some data regarding the bakers' revenue and expenditure over a period of five important years in the history of the York Corpus Christi play.<sup>6</sup>

	Bakers' pageant money	Contributions from other crafts	Total receipts	Approximate expenses of play	Reparations to pageant house
1553	14s. 6d.	5s. 0d.	19s. 6d.	22s. 11d. plus 1s. (?) <sup>7</sup>	13s. 7d. plus (?) <sup>8</sup>
1554	14s. 6d.	5s. 6d.	20s. 0d.	13s. 4d.	—
1555	14s. (6d.)	7s. 11d.	22s. 5d. (?)	16s. 8d.	—
1556	16s. 6d.	6s. 6d.	23s. 0d.	16s. 10d.	—
1557	16s. 0d.	6s. 4d.	22s. 4d.	16s. 10d.	—

The York Bakers' Accounts pale in interest before the liveliness of the Coventry records with the redoubtable Fawston in the double rôle of hanging Judas and cockcrowing, or of the black and white souls and those

<sup>1</sup> Add. MS 34604, f 6b, *York Plays*, p. xxxv

<sup>2</sup> Add. MS 33852, f 39, 1573. 'Item spent whan we went with a wright to se our paygyant howse ijd' Also, f. 25b, 1565. 'Item geuyn to John hyll for keypyng the padgyan hous iij d'

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 7, 9, 10, 12, 12b, 16, 20, 21, 22.

<sup>4</sup> In 1544, f 5b, xij d., in 1545, f 6b, xij d.; 1549, f 10b, xij d.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, ff 36, 43

<sup>6</sup> Torch expenses (*supra*, p 153) are not included, nor are the payments and receipts for pageant house rent, which nearly balance (*supra*, p. 155).

<sup>7</sup> The amount for mending the lamb and painting the diadems is obliterated (f 13), but, in 1557, 1s was paid 'ffor iij dyadems & the lam mendyng'.

<sup>8</sup> The amount for lime to the pageant house and sand and bearing of it is obliterated. A similar item in 1577, f 40b, cost viij s.

two intriguing worms of conscience; before the intimacy of the Chester Smiths' Accounts or even of the less known Perth Hammermen's Accounts where the individual craftsmen in their play-rôles come to life. Nor can they rival the more vivid York Mercers' Accounts, the only other York accounts which we have for comparison. If these sixteenth-century accounts are a faithful index, the York bakers did their duty by their play adequately, unostentatiously. But would that in their records they had more liberally interpreted the motto of their own Ordinary:

He that giueth measure  
God blessethe with treasure.<sup>1</sup>

ANNA J. MILL.

SOUTH HADLEY, MASS., U.S.A

<sup>1</sup> 'The Bakers of York and their Ancient Ordinary', *Archaeological Review*, I, p 126.

## UT PICTURA POESIS

IN the minds of eighteenth-century Englishmen the arts were closely linked together. This is a fact of importance in the study of the art and letters of that period, and it has not been sufficiently recognised. In theory they asserted that the unity and harmony of nature appeared in the bonds between man's artistic creations; and their practice supported this belief. Landscape gardeners altered scenery in accordance with the painters' methods of selecting and composing natural features; architects designed buildings with a view to their environment in these estates. Landscape painters, deriving their style from Claude and the popular Italians, painted scenes which should have literary or historical interest. The dramatic quality in Hogarth's work was conscious and evident. Nor was literature exempt. Many of the poets were connoisseurs or amateur painters;<sup>1</sup> and poetry was often associated with painting by writers on art and men of letters.

It is not surprising that poets and critics should have shared the general interest in painting, in an age which saw the rise of the great English schools of landscape and portraiture. Connoisseurship was developing, and collections were being formed which enriched England with foreign spoils. Moreover, the appreciation of painting during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was chiefly confined to the literary associations and dramatic possibilities of its subjects, and to the knowledge of history and psychology shown in the treatment of them. And as the study of its principles developed, writers on art, stimulated by Horace's *De Arte Poetica*, had turned to literary criticism for guidance.<sup>2</sup>

The result was a half-literary conception of painting; and the parallelism between the two arts, which had its inception in the treatises of Du Jon and Du Fresnoy,<sup>3</sup> was more fully developed by their successors. The century following Dryden's *Parallel of Poetry and Painting*, appended to his translation of Du Fresnoy, shows a continual support and elaboration of the ideas they propounded. With the current conception of

<sup>1</sup> Thomson, Dyer, Pope, Akenside, Shenstone, the younger Wartons, Armstrong, etc. See E. W. Manwaring, *Italian Landscape in Eighteenth-Century England* (1925), for some account of this practical interest.

<sup>2</sup> Du Fresnoy, for instance, asserted that the most important figure in a piece should be set in the strongest light, and in the centre. He was echoed not only by Dryden and Shaftesbury, but by the artists who followed him, until Reynolds doubted his wisdom, and Fuseli derided him.

<sup>3</sup> F. Du Jon, *The Painting of the Ancients* (1638), C. A. Du Fresnoy, *De Arte Graphica. The Art of Painting*... (1695).

'historical' painting as the highest form of the art, painting was found to resemble poetry in having definite 'fables' or thoughts to convey to the intellect. Like poetry it needed unity of design, subordination of minor characters to the principal, decorum and relevance of detail, and so forth. In these matters the likeness between the two arts was evident.

The fashion was to find literary characteristics in painting. But there was a reciprocal though less pronounced bias in the conception of poetry. Its frequent and often mechanical association with painting resulted in a merging of their principles, and some of the obvious characteristics of visual art were looked for in poetry. As Horace had remarked, and the early eighteenth century echoed, poetry was 'a speaking picture'; then it should endeavour to present ideas in the same way, that is, it should convey them through the visible appearances of things. And this should be its chief aim.

This theory was supported by the belief in the importance of sight as the source of our ideas. Sanderson in his *Graphice* (1658) had commented on the wide scope of the pleasures afforded by 'the eyes, the looking-glasses of Nature', and considered that poetic descriptions which recall the appearance of objects are as effective as a pictorial reproduction. In illustration he gives a poetic account of a view at sea which he calls a 'challenge in the name of Apollo to the art of Apelles'. Addison develops this opinion. His theory is an extension of Locke's on the sources of ideas, and assigns paramount importance to the sense of sight. Not only is it more receptive than the other senses, but is indeed the sole source of the ideas of the imagination. 'We cannot indeed', he says, 'have a single image in the fancy which did not make its first entrance through the sight, but we have the power of retaining, altering and compounding those images';<sup>1</sup> for other sensations only raise images in so far as they are comprehended by the sight. Sight being for Addison the source of ideas, those arts are most natural which most perfectly reproduce the qualities that sight apprehends. So he ranks sculpture highest, then painting, and poetry last. Even in his estimate of music, he considers the value of its appeal lies in its power to evoke scenes, not in harmonies of sound, or qualities affecting the ear alone. What he calls the primary pleasures of the imagination 'entirely proceed from such objects as are before our eyes'; and the secondary 'flow from the ideas of visible objects, when the objects are not actually before our eyes, but are called up into our memories, or formed into agreeable visions of things that are either absent or fictitious'. The effect of a picture is no different from that which

<sup>1</sup> *Spectator*, No. 411.

the objects would have in reality.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, since the eye has this comprehensive power, the appeal of poetry is stronger when it is made as directly as possible to the sight. The value of allegory and metaphor lies in their pictorial significance.<sup>2</sup>

Succeeding writers hold the same opinion. Hughes in his *Essay on Descriptions in Poetry* (1735) assigns the popularity of descriptive poems to the fact that they make 'a livelier impression on common readers, because they are formed of ideas drawn from the senses ..and are there in a manner like pictures made the objects of sight'. Akenside's description of the imagination follows Addison. All the ideas that rise in the artist's mind are visual, and he has then to translate them into words, sound or line.<sup>3</sup> George Turnbull considered that 'Beauty signifies a satisfaction which certain visible objects are adapted to give to the sight', and refers the reader to *The Spectator*.<sup>4</sup> Addison's example appears to be responsible for his outlook on nature, which he treats as a series of potential pictures which art combines to 'make a beautiful whole'. This opinion strengthened his purpose in writing his treatise, where 'the main point aimed at, and always kept in view, is the connection of Painting with Poetry, and both with Philosophy'. Beauty is a visual quality; and since both poet and painter delineate it, their material is the same.

The result is an interaction between poetry, painting, and the appearances of nature upon which they both draw. Poetry can enrich the mind and store it with ideas that a painter will wish to express—witness the example of Rubens,<sup>5</sup> and a knowledge of poetry will help the ordinary man to appreciate the 'fine prospects of nature's beauties. .when they recall to the mind a beautiful lively description of any like prospect in some good poet'. This opinion is interesting in view of the contemporary vogue for descriptive poetry. Joseph Warton, indeed, supports Turnbull by citing a specific example; for he observes that '*The Seasons* of Thomson have been very instrumental in diffusing a general taste for the beauties of nature and landscape', and notes that as a result of its popularity, 'It is only within the last few years that the picturesque scenes of our country.. have been visited and described'.<sup>6</sup> Dryden had recommended a study of pictures to the poet, because the best poets 'when they desire to celebrate any extraordinary beauty, are forced to have recourse to statues and pictures'. The painter Richardson had held the same

<sup>1</sup> *Spectator*, Nos. 411, 412

<sup>2</sup> *Spectator*, No. 421.

<sup>3</sup> *The Pleasures of Imagination*, 2nd version, III, 1 395.

<sup>4</sup> *A Treatise on Ancient Painting* (1740). Cp. Hogarth, *Analysis of Beauty*, p. 13; Lord Kames, *The Elements of Criticism in Poetry*.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Gessner's Letter to Fuseli, *On Landscape Painting* (1806), II, p. 180.

<sup>6</sup> *Essay on Pope* (1806), II, p. 180.



belief in the fertilising power of the arts, and in the mutual assistance given by poets and painters, and Turnbull observed that a knowledge of painting will increase appreciation of poetic descriptions, which are often inspired by pictures. For the poet endeavours to put before the mind's eye those appearances which the painter reproduces directly to the physical.<sup>1</sup>

Even Burke, since he starts from the same assumption that beauty is inherent in objects and chiefly visual, speaks of poetry and painting together as imitative arts. But at the end of his essay, when he studies more fully the effect of words, he denies that poetry is directly imitative.<sup>2</sup> Words operate as symbols, and though they may be strongly emotive, are rarely powerful in evoking clear images. 'The truth is, all verbal description, merely as naked description, though never so exact, conveys so poor and insufficient an idea of the thing described, that it could scarcely have the smallest effect, if the speaker did not call in to his aid those modes of speech that mark a strong and lively feeling in himself.' Goldsmith in his criticism of Burke evidently expresses it as a novel idea that 'the term painting in poetry perhaps implies more than the mere assemblage of such pictures as affect the sight', and Cooper shows this new outlook in praising Collins' *Ode to Evening* because the picture evoked is modified by the feeling and sentiments of the poet, and is therefore more effective than if it had appealed to the eye alone.<sup>3</sup> Such opinions are sporadic, however. Burke's followers were not fully alive to the implications at the end of his essay. Reynolds was later to say, 'No art can be engrafted with success on another art'.<sup>4</sup> But in the middle of the century this was not the current view.

To those who compared the arts, the likenesses seemed clearer because the study of content was separated from that of form, in the modern sense. Dryden and his successors could ignore the differences because of their views on the function of colour and words. Until the latter half of the eighteenth century colour was considered a mere appendage to the linear design;<sup>5</sup> and this fact could be paralleled in poetry, for words were likewise an extrinsic beauty. Evidence of this outlook is plentiful both in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; it was indeed the traditional Renaissance conception of the value of words. They were poetic orna-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 'An Essay on Description in Poetry', *St James' Journal*, April 20, 1723.

<sup>2</sup> *The Sublime and Beautiful*, Part v

<sup>3</sup> J. G. Cooper, *Letters Concerning Taste* (1755), p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> *Discourse XIII* (1786).

<sup>5</sup> Du Fresnoy, Richardson, Hogarth, the French Academicians. Even Reynolds holds this traditional view, except when he lets his personal feeling get the better of his academic caution.

ment, to be treated apart from the subject and design.<sup>1</sup> The vital importance of the media was not realised. It was only recognised after a century of more or less detailed studies, that the difference of medium implied differences of conception and expression;<sup>2</sup> and the necessary changes of thought do not unite and culminate until Lessing's *Laocoon*.

The result of this confusion of function is that poetry is treated at times as a form of painting. In the more detailed parallels poetry was shown to have the same principles of design as painting, and the custom of regarding poetry as a picture in words is also found in purely literary criticism. As Warton put it, 'It is the peculiar privilege of poetry not only to place material objects in the most amiable attitudes, but also to give life and motion to immaterial beings; and form, colour and action, even to abstract ideas'<sup>3</sup> Though he asserts that poetry has peculiar characteristics, he treats it as a more extensive kind of painting. It was a common habit. The painter's terminology often appears in literary criticism without any sense of adapted usage. Even Goldsmith catches the jargon, and criticises Shakespeare as if he had been a painter.<sup>4</sup>

Such criticism has little value in throwing light on the poet's methods, or in illustrating the apparent connexion between the two arts. But the idea of their interdependence is more important when critics of literature affect to find similarity between paintings and certain passages of poetry. Mechanical—and obvious—comparisons between poets and painters, such as Spenser and Rubens, or Poussin and Theocritus, were common enough.<sup>5</sup> But there were also comparisons which showed a deeper interest in the correspondences between literature and painting. Such interest is apparent in Nichols' words on Fielding 'His works exhibit a series of pictures drawn with all the descriptive fidelity of a Hogarth'—or in Goldsmith's comparison of Poussin's paintings and Addison's *Cato*: he says Addison's figures, like Poussin's, are faultlessly drawn from the antique, but have no life to sustain their action—an allusion which is hardly just to Poussin.<sup>6</sup> Daniel Webb observed, 'One would imagine

<sup>1</sup> Sir William Temple, for example, separates 'Expression' from 'the Frame or Fabrick' (*Of Poetry*)

<sup>2</sup> Shaftesbury, *Characteristics* (1773), J. Richardson, *Works* (1773), G. Turnbull, *A Treatise on Ancient Painting* (1740), D. Webb, *An Inquiry into the Beauties of Painting* (1760), J. Harris, *Three Treatises* (1774), etc.

<sup>3</sup> *The Guardian*, No. 57, May 22, 1753. Cp. *Essay on Pope* (1806), I, p. 313.

<sup>4</sup> *Literary Magazine*, Jan. 1758. Cp. *Critical Review*, May 1762.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. E. W. Manwaring for an account of these.

<sup>6</sup> *Literary Magazine*, 1758.

that Pope had been animated by the spirit of Correggio, and had taken possession of his pencil when he thus pictures his sylphs,

Some in the fields of purest aether play,  
And bask and whiten in the blaze of day'<sup>1</sup>

This comparison gains in significance if one considers Reynolds' words on Correggio. 'His style is founded upon modern grace and elegance, to which is super-added something of the simplicity of the grand style' (*Discourse IV*). Pope's interest in painting was well known; and the fact that he was at one time a pupil of Jervas was commemorated in his *Epistle*. This naturally suggested that his work had affinities with the sister art in which he dabbled. Common interests led Joseph Warton to remark on Pope's allusions to painting, and a critic in *The Gentleman's Magazine* selected, as being especially pictorial, the couplet from his *Homer*,

O'er the dark trees a yellower verdure shed,  
And tip with silver every mountain head,

for 'painting, it is well known, was, next to its twin sister poetry, the art in which Mr Pope most eminently excelled, and such exquisite traits of both has he given us in these two inimitable lines'.<sup>2</sup>

There was a tendency to see signs of the influence of specific painters, or pictures, in poetry. Glover's simile of Aeolus summoning the winds, when Leonidas' men gather round him, is said to be reminiscent of a picture, for 'painting, they say, is nearly ally'd to versification, and it is evident that the author received the first hint of this exquisitely beautiful similitude from that inimitable print of Aeolus and his little puffing myrmidons in the Dauphin editions of Virgil'.<sup>3</sup> It might, indeed, have been taken from many other pictures of the winds. Webb quotes the *Aeneid*, I, 590, as 'the finest effect of clear obscure that perhaps ever entered into the imagination of either poet or painter.. I am persuaded the poet must have had in his eye some celebrated picture in this style'.<sup>4</sup> The pictorial quality in Virgil's work called forth comment from others too. Turnbull was disposed to attribute the origin of some of his descriptions to well-known works of art; and Joseph Warton observed that 'one who has not been a little conversant with pictures, statues and bas-reliefs, will not be able to enter fully into the beauties of those described by Homer and Virgil'.<sup>5</sup> Both the Wartons displayed their connoisseurship in contributions to *The World* and *The Adventurer*,<sup>6</sup> though

<sup>1</sup> *Inquiry*, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine*, April 1737.

<sup>5</sup> *Essay*, II, p. 14.

<sup>6</sup> *World*, June 28, 1753; *Adventurer*, Jan. 22, 1754.

<sup>2</sup> April 1774.

<sup>4</sup> *Inquiry*, p. 106.

their views were comfortably orthodox, and Thomas Warton thought that since Milton was the first poet to describe Raphael as an armed angel, he must have been indebted to painting, having probably seen such pictures in Italy, 'and particularly one by Raphael, where Michael, clad in celestial panoply, triumphs over Satan chained'<sup>1</sup>

The critics' interest in painting was valuable, because it helped to open their eyes to descriptive and pictorial effects in literature, and perhaps to stimulate the development of biographical criticism. The range of appreciation is widened to include qualities not wholly measurable by the formal rules. Although this awakened interest usually appears in literary criticism incidentally, it is none the less genuine, and has the freshness of personal and original observation. The belief in the close connexion between the arts is not confined to the enunciation of common principles, or to comments on passages that seem to show the influence of certain painters. Webb's criticism of Virgil, for instance, shows an interest in Virgil's descriptive methods which is not stimulated by the knowledge of any pictorial originals. He has observed, not the correspondence with the work of any known artist, but the picturesque treatment of the material, which presents a likeness to the painter's.

Elsewhere, too, there is evidence of an approach akin to Webb's. Descriptions are regarded as potential pictures, affording inspiration to the artist, or are criticised as if the poet ought to make a conscious effort to dispose his materials pictorially. Turnbull clearly expressed this critical standpoint when he said that poetry and painting were complementary, and this attitude is responsible for criticisms which drew attention to the picturesque element in poems, and to passages that seemed particularly fit for graphic representation. One of the most notable examples was of course provided by the Comte de Caylus, he selected from Homer and Virgil passages that seemed so eminently suitable for the painter that he 'has nothing to do but to substitute his colours for the words of Homer';<sup>2</sup> and R. J. L., writing to Barry, is of the same opinion, and thinks it a pity that painters do not go more often to Homer for inspiration. Joseph Warton occasionally shows a similar attitude. With an observant eye for vivid pictorial effects, he praises Virgil's lines describing Dido's death, which 'have here painted the dying Dido as powerfully as the pencil of Reynolds has done when she is just dead'.<sup>3</sup> His criticism

<sup>1</sup> *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser* (1754), p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> *Tableaux tirés de l'Iliade, de l'Odyssée d'Homère, et de l'Énéide de Virgile*. Praised by J. Warton (*Essay*, i, pp. 364-5) and in *Critical Review*, 1759.

<sup>3</sup> *Essay*, ii, pp. 163-4. Of Pope's *Temple of Fame* he says, 'A real lover of painting... will return to it again and again'.

of Thomson, too, shows how acquaintance with popular landscape painters stimulated his appreciation. In his opinion, Thomson's scenes are 'frequently as wild and romantic as those of Salvator Rosa'; and he praises the exactness of description and grouping of certain passages as 'worthy the pencil of Giacomo Bassano, and so minutely delineated that he might have worked from this sketch

On the grassy bank  
Some ruminating he; while others stand  
Half in the flood, and often bending sip  
The circling surface'<sup>1</sup>

The poets were thought to resemble painters in their disposal of scenic effects, even when there had not been as obvious an attempt as in the above quotation. Warton comments thus on a passage in Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard* 'This scene would make a fine subject for the pencil, and is worthy of a capital painter. He might place Eloisa in the long aisle of a great Gothic church, a lamp should hang over her head, whose dim and dismal ray should afford only light enough to make darkness visible. She herself should be represented in the instant when she first hears the aerial voice, and in the attitude of starting round with astonishment and fear. And this was the method a very great master took to paint a sound, if I may be allowed the expression'.<sup>2</sup> Evidently, Warton's interest in painting increased his powers of visualisation, so that hints of description in poetry acquired greater significance. John Dyer, being both poet and painter, displays a similar readiness to visualise scenes from slight hints; and it appears in his criticism of Aaron Hill's *Gideon*, which he treats as an achievement in graphic representation. Scott of Amwell speculated like Warton, in his comments on Gray's *Elegy*. Oddly enough, he ignores the pictorial felicity of the opening stanzas, and selects the thirteenth for comment. 'The stanza in question would afford a fine picture, two of Gray's forefathers of the hamlet might be introduced, reposing from their labour; dignity and grace might be given to their forms, the eye of one beaming celestial fire might cast a regretful look at Knowledge turning from him with her folded roll; the other might indignantly regard Penury, who at a distance should, with a calm severity of countenance, point out to him a plough, or some other instrument of that cultivation which it was his lot to attend to'.<sup>3</sup> Like Warton, Scott seems to have an eye

<sup>1</sup> *Essay*, I, pp. 41, 43-4.

<sup>2</sup> Here, as I watch'd the dying lamps around,  
From yonder shrine I heard a solemn sound;  
Come, sister, come (it said, or seem'd to say):  
Thy place is here, sad sister, come away.

<sup>3</sup> *Critical Essays*, p. 205 (note).

trained to notice the possibilities of illustration in poetry—though perhaps trained by lower branches of art. His proposed design is like the allegorical devices in eighteenth-century book illustration, one can visualise such a picture as a frontispiece to the *Elegy*, like the frontispieces to Shaftesbury's works, or to Pope's *Essay on Man*. Scott's idea is an expression of the same outlook as Warton's, but it is incongruous because the critic is in advance of the poet. Scott reads into Gray's lines a quality his poetry generally lacks, the pictorial splendour and life which appears occasionally in Collins' personifications, and culminates in the poetry of later romantics like Keats. But the wish is father to the thought. Scott's habit of seeking connexions between poetry and painting led him not only to observe pictorial effects, but to feel surprise when the poet failed to produce them. Criticising *Cooper's Hill*, he remarks on the absence of any intention to group the descriptive details as in a picture; and because it is lacking, he considers Denham has failed to make the most of his reference to the Thames.

The descriptive poet was expected to emulate the landscape painter. The passage on the Severn in Dyer's *The Fleece* was praised thus. 'In this agreeable landscape we perceive that the objects are properly placed, the figures well grouped, and the ordonnance of the piece just and natural. We shall find also on a closer examination that the colours are excellent, the strokes masterly, and the whole picture highly finished'.<sup>1</sup> But Gilpin found fault with the description of the ruins in *Grongar Hill*, because the ivy mantling their walls could not be seen at that distance.

A significant summary of the eighteenth-century ideal of poetic description is given by Thomas Warton. He objects to the lack of pictorial truth in Milton's description of Eden. 'It requires', says Warton, 'much greater strength of mind to form an assemblage of natural objects, and range them with propriety and beauty, than to bring together the greatest variety of the most splendid images, without any regard to their use or congruity; as in painting he who, by the force of his imagination, can delineate a landscape, is deemed a greater master than he who, by heaping rocks of coral upon tessellated pavements, can only make absurdity splendid'.<sup>2</sup> Milton's description conveys the atmosphere of the scenes by appealing to the emotions through various sensuous effects; and his description of Paradise expresses its beauty and luxuriance by the selection of representative objects, not by careful enumeration of the features of the landscapes. But in the mid-eighteenth century the de-

<sup>1</sup> *Critical Review*, 1757.

<sup>2</sup> *Adventurer*, Oct. 23, 1753.

scriptive poet, like the painter, was expected to convey as clearly as possible the effect upon the sight, and he could only do this if he attended to details of contour and colour.

Such criticism, which borrowed its terms and imagery from painting, and demanded of the poet the painter's eye, found justification in contemporary fact. The difference Warton spoke of was the difference between the descriptions of Milton and those of Thomson or Dyer. Contemporary poets shared the interest in painting, and attempted to follow the painter's methods in their own art. The influence is apparent in their descriptions of scenes adapted to fit the Claudian plan,<sup>1</sup> and also in their observation of subtleties of colour, light and shade, or the effects of distance. Their diction in such descriptions has a strong appeal to the eye. Words are chosen for their value in strengthening the visual impression; and the desire for clear definition makes for simplicity and directness of phrasing. But their language lacks the emotive power of sound or association; its emotional gift is a reproduction of the feeling that the actual scenes would arouse. One of the most ambitious of such poems, Jago's *Edge Hill*, is prefaced with a significant quotation from Addison on the sense of sight, and purports to be 'divided, by an imaginary line, into a number of distinct scenes, corresponding with the different times of day, each forming an entire picture, and containing its due proportion of objects and colouring'. It is noticeable that the most conscious 'painters' depended most on detail—Jago, or Scott of Amwell, with his painstaking accuracy. Or Smith of Chichester, whose 'profession as a landscape painter induced him to study nature very attentively; and the beautiful scenes he often examined furnished him with a great variety of ideas', which he expressed in his *Six Pastorals* (1770). Or Dyer, also a painter, but a poet too, not a versifier. They rarely showed Thomson's power of conveying a scene vividly by general effects as well, when the features of the landscape are united only by the changing beauty of light.

Johnson probably had their poetry in mind when he said that the business of the poet was not to 'number the streaks of the tulip, or describe the different shades in the verdure of the forest'.<sup>2</sup> He had the traditional preference for general terms. But the current theory and practice of poets encouraged the praise of particulars. Beattie, who disliked 'generalities', asserted 'That poetical description ought to be distinct and lively, and such as might both assist the fancy, and direct the hand, of the painter, is an acknowledged truth in criticism. The best poets are

<sup>1</sup> Cp. E. W. Manwaring for a citation of such instances.

<sup>2</sup> *Rasselas*. Incidentally, Johnson's references to painting are usually disparaging.

the most picturesque ... And one cause of the insipidity of the *Henriade* is, that its scenery and images are described in too general terms' Although elsewhere he contrasts the Dutch painters unfavourably with Raphael and Reynolds, in support of generalisation,<sup>1</sup> it had indeed been the tradition to rank as 'low' styles the genres which seemed most concerned with particulars. Johnson was refusing to acknowledge the merit of their literary equivalents when he said, 'Poetry cannot dwell upon the minuter distinctions, by which one species differs from another, without departing from that simplicity of grandeur which fills the imagination' <sup>2</sup> Burke's theories, however, helped to justify them—oddly enough, since his observations on words were really a challenge to the descriptive school. But he distinguished between the sublime and beautiful, and so offered justification of the lower styles, they were beautiful if not sublime. Blair, for instance, conceded that for grand, sublime and pathetic subjects, poetry should be concise and selective, but 'descriptions of gay and smiling scenes may without any disadvantage be amplified and prolonged. Force is not the predominant quality expected in these'. For beauty in poetry 'denotes a manner neither remarkably sublime nor vehemently passionate', but gently raises feeling 'similar to what is raised by the contemplation of beautiful objects in nature'.<sup>3</sup> Reynolds in his earlier *Discourses* followed tradition, in his estimate of the low or natural styles, and the importance of generalisation. But in the later *Discourses*, he sometimes came near recanting—when he allowed himself to praise Gainsborough, or approved of the close discrimination in Titian's landscapes <sup>4</sup> And he did so when he clarified his meaning of 'particulars', in the eighth and eleventh *Discourses*. Blake, it is true, continually attacks Reynolds for his insistence on general ideas. But his annotations to the *Discourses* end with the eighth; and end, too, with approbation of a statement which showed Reynolds' maturing views. But the *Discourses* indeed show other traces of a changing outlook. Reynolds' generalisations on the arts are usually based on the current belief in their affinity. Yet when his career was nearly ended, he asserted that no art could be engrafted successfully on another art.<sup>5</sup> It was an answer to some who still held that 'Ut pictura poesis erit'.

CICELY DAVIES.

NEWPORT, MON.

<sup>1</sup> *Essays on Poetry and Music* (1779), pp. 57, 89

<sup>2</sup> *Rambler*, No. 36, on pastoral poetry.

<sup>3</sup> *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (1783)

<sup>4</sup> *Discourses* XI, XIV.

<sup>5</sup> *Discourse* XIII.



## NOTES ON THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA IN MEDIÆVAL SPAIN AND THE ORIGINS OF THE 'AUTO SACRAMENTAL'

THE history of the drama in mediæval Spain has never been adequately studied. This is chiefly due to the paucity of texts, notices and documents. Spain has indeed been unfortunate in the loss of her earliest literary works, and it is in the drama, both religious and secular, that this loss is perhaps most seriously felt. The subject is important enough to justify an attempt to remedy this deficiency in view of the unique development of the Miracles and Moralities into the *Auto Sacramental* and the perfection given to this type of drama by Calderón. The scantiness of the material upon which to work precludes for the time being a complete and final study of this question. Nevertheless, insufficient attention has been paid to those documents whose discovery has rewarded painstaking search, and their full significance has been missed. The whole question of the origin and early history of the *Auto Sacramental* is still unnecessarily obscure, and it is with the intention of throwing some light on this that I have endeavoured in this article to summarise most of the existing and little-known evidence as to the mediæval church drama in Spain.

The first fact that strikes us is the tardiness of the development of the religious drama when compared with that of other countries. This is easily understandable in view of the peculiar position of Spain in mediæval Europe. But, though Spain developed much later than France or England, she followed the same lines. The liturgical drama, i.e., plays performed in the churches at Christmas and Easter as part of the Divine Office, arose in the same way. Two Easter tropes from Silos showing the earliest and normal European form prove this to have been the case<sup>1</sup>. But there is no connecting link between this and the fragment of the vernacular liturgical play, the *Misterio de los Reyes Magos*, a fairly advanced version of the *Stella* theme which seems to date from the middle of the twelfth century. Even if these few lines had not survived, the existence of the Christmas and Easter plays in Spain would have been proved from the often-quoted passage in the thirteenth-century Code of Law, the *Siete Partidas*, which also proves that the *gaya sciencia*, cultivated with enthusiasm in Spain by king, courtier and professional singer alike,

<sup>1</sup> C. Lange, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (Munich, 1887), pp. 24-5.

had the same effect on the liturgical drama as it had in France. This minstrel and folk spirit had triumphed to such an extent that not only had it produced a secular and popular drama, *juegos de escarnio*, but it had pushed its way into the very churches and become a grave cause of scandal. Clerics are forbidden to sanction the performance of such plays in churches or to have any part whatever in their production. But, the law continues, there are plays which clerics may produce; these are the Nativity of Christ, in which the Angel appears to the Shepherds, the visit of the Magi, and the Resurrection. These plays should be acted with respect and devotion, and only in the larger cities where the bishops can superintend their production. They should not be performed in villages nor for financial profit.

This reveals the existence and popularity of the two main groups of liturgical plays, but it also reveals how the civil authorities assisted the Church in her endeavour to check all abuses. This was as severe an administrative problem in Spain as in France, and the abuses proved as difficult to eradicate.<sup>1</sup> The Feast of Fools, the Boy Bishop, *Obispoillo*, and the sword dance known as the *Degollación*, were all difficult to suppress. Notices of the Boy Bishop in Spanish cathedrals can still be found in the sixteenth century. In Lérida and Gerona this popular ceremony, there called the *Bisbató*, was not finally abolished until the end of that century.<sup>2</sup> The Council of Toledo of 1324 vainly attempted to forbid all dancing in churches. That of Aranda in 1473 prohibited all *larvas, ludos, monstra, spectacula, figmenta et tumultuationes*, but hastened to add. *per hoc tam honestas repraesentationes et devotas, quae populum ad devotionem movent, tam in praefatis diebus quam in aliis non intendimus prohibere.*<sup>3</sup> This pantomimic spirit, later cloaked in baroque symbolism, continued in the *tarasca* wheeled in the procession before the performance of the *Autos Sacramentales*, and can still be recognised to-day in the grotesque figures carried round in Spanish Holy-Week processions.

The evolution of the liturgical drama into the Miracle plays, i.e., religious plays dealing with Old and New Testament subjects and the lives of the Saints, performed publicly in the open by the Guilds, occurred in Europe in the thirteenth century. But it is not until the fourteenth

<sup>1</sup> As early as 589 the famous third Council of Toledo, in the presence of King Reccared and St Leander, had prohibited all pantomimic behaviour in the churches. Cf. Cardinal J. S. Aguirre, *Collectio Maxima Conciliorum Omnium Hispaniae et Novi Orbis* (Rome, 1693), II, p. 348.

<sup>2</sup> M. Milá y Fontanals, 'Orígenes del Teatro Catalán', in *Obras Completas* (Barcelona, 1895), VI, pp. 213-14.

<sup>3</sup> Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* (Paris, 1902), XXXII, col. 397.

century that we find any notice of this transition in Spain, and it is not until the following century that we can definitely point to any fully developed Miracle plays. It is in Catalonia that documents bearing on this are most numerous. It was the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi with its outdoor procession that first brought these church dramas into the open. The *consueta* of Gerona Cathedral, dated 1360, which, to the best of my knowledge, has not yet been printed in full, apparently gives some account of these new dramatic performances. It is there recorded<sup>1</sup> that the feast of Corpus Christi (probably introduced into Gerona by Berenguer de Palaciolo, who died in 1314) was celebrated by a procession through the streets in which giant figures were borne along, and in which the beneficiaries of the cathedral 'performed plays' in the public squares. The plays were the *Sacrifice of Isaac*, the *Dream and Selling of Joseph*, and 'other sacred subjects'. Freiherr von Schack took it for granted that these were *plays*, and this has never been questioned. It is, however, extremely unlikely that these *repræsentationes* were at this date anything more than processional tableaux or pageants, in view of the fact that it was not until a very much later date that similar tableaux were transformed into plays at Valencia and Barcelona. It is impossible to believe that Gerona could have been some sixty or seventy years in advance of these other much more important cities.<sup>2</sup>

The continued popularity and development of the liturgical drama and its survival well into the sixteenth century would also make it unlikely that Miracle plays were really established by 1360. But the liturgical drama tended to widen its scope in the direction of the Miracle plays, and became connected with feasts other than Christmas and Easter. The *Prophetæ* was always popular, and the recitation of the Sibyl survived in several churches in Catalonia for many years.<sup>3</sup> In Gerona a liturgical play treating of St Stephen's martyrdom was regularly performed in the sanctuary when the Saint's memory was read at the second vespers of Christmas.<sup>4</sup> And in 1473 it was decided that plays should be acted every Sunday unless the feast of St Thomas Aquinas should fall on a Sunday; nevertheless, on one occasion when this did happen a play of the Temptation of Christ was produced in the afternoon. A year later the Chapter

<sup>1</sup> See the account of the *consueta* given by Fr. José de la Canal in *España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1832), xlv, pp. 15 ff., especially p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> The original text of the document would help to throw some light on this question. Fr. José de la Canal merely states that *los beneficiados de la catedral representaban el sacrificio de Isaac*, etc. He would not have realised that the word *repræsentatio* (probably used here), as well as its vernacular equivalent, did not necessarily imply any dramatic action.

<sup>3</sup> Milá y Fontanals, *op cit*, pp. 294-311.

<sup>4</sup> Recorded in a document of 1380, *España Sagrada*, xlv, p. 17.

agreed to preserve the customary Resurrection play performed at matins on Easter morning which some members suggested should be abolished.<sup>1</sup> The abolition of this Easter play was again the subject of discussion by the Chapter in 1534. An *acta capitular* of that year records the decision of the Chapter to continue the annual performance of this traditional play, *quae vulgo dicitur les tres Maries*, and the rules they laid down for its production in a more edifying manner.<sup>2</sup> The play seems to have been a rather late version of the *Quem quaeritis* type, to which had been added various scenes representing the episode of the Centurion—this must have been part of a Passion play—the apparition of Christ to St Mary Magdalen, and the incredulity of St Thomas. But these additional scenes had given rise to abuses of some sort which were considered detrimental to the devotional spirit of the original play, and the Chapter decided to forbid them. In this way the liturgical drama expanded towards the more extensive range of the Miracles, but was reduced to its former simplicity by reformatory measures. These same reformatory measures, in conformity with the process of centralisation then coming to a head, gradually unified and stereotyped the liturgy in all Spanish churches. The liturgical plays then finally disappeared, and the Corpus Christi *autos*, by that time completely secularised, alone survived. But as late as 1581 a Nativity play was still being performed in the cathedral at Huesca.<sup>3</sup>

Liturgical plays were popular in Valencia Cathedral. These required some form of scenery and mechanical devices. On the Feast of Pentecost, for instance, a dove descended from the roof in the midst of bursting fireworks intended to represent the tongues of fire. This celebration, known as *la Colometa*, was also popular at Lérida. It was forbidden at Valencia by Bishop Vidal de Blanes (1356–9), but it was soon revived. In 1469 the High Altar caught fire, it was then definitely prohibited. An attempt was made to abolish it at Lérida in 1518, but so great was the popular outcry that it had to be restored.<sup>4</sup>

There were also pageants in the cathedral at Valencia in which the clerks represented various New Testament figures, and during the Christmas matins a statue portraying the Virgin and Child was let down from the roof. In 1440 Eve is mentioned as one of the characters in the Christmas play, and in 1531 some form of the *Prophetæ* was still being

<sup>1</sup> Milá y Fontanals, *op. cit.*, p. 210

<sup>2</sup> This interesting document is too lengthy to reproduce here. It can be read in *España Sagrada*, XLV, pp. 23–4

<sup>3</sup> R. del Arco, 'Misterios, Autos Sacramentales y otras fiestas en la Catedral de Huesca', in *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos* (1920), xli, p. 263. See also Milá y Fontanals, *op. cit.*, p. 217 n.

<sup>4</sup> Milá y Fontanals, *op. cit.*, pp. 212–13.

acted. In 1520 scenery was installed in the choir in which the walls and towers of Bethlehem were painted.<sup>1</sup> Three plays written for the Feast of the Assumption reveal this gradual transition from the simple liturgical play to the more developed Miracle while still intended for performance in church. The best of these is the fragment described by Mérimée,<sup>2</sup> which dates perhaps from the end of the fourteenth century and which may have been performed annually at Valencia. The Catalan *Representació de la assumpció de madona Santa Maria*, of unknown origin, is also of the late fourteenth century.<sup>3</sup> The third of these is the well-known *Misterio de Elche* which is still performed at the present day. As it now stands the text is of the first half of the sixteenth century, but the play must have originated at least a century earlier.<sup>4</sup> These late liturgical plays were therefore no monopoly of the larger cities, and the smaller the town or village the more jealously would it guard its own particular play. Elche is not the only town that has preserved the tradition. At Vallibona, for instance, in the province of Castellón, a short rendering of the Sacrifice of Isaac still survives as part of the Corpus Christi procession, and some villages in the north of the same province still perform on the feast of St Anthony the Abbot a play in his honour. The oldest of the various versions is apparently the one performed at Cinctorres.<sup>5</sup> In Mallorca these liturgical plays seem to have reached their highest development round the year 1420 when the accounts of Palma Cathedral show the greatest expenditure for this purpose. The plays performed were known as *consuetas*, *cobles*, *auctos*, *obras* and *representacions*. Some of these have survived in a late sixteenth-century MS. collection. They approximate to the Miracles by presenting an unusually wide variety of subjects from the Old and New Testaments and the lives of the Saints. Those which dramatise these latter themes are apparently later than 1450, and others are of still later date. Some, however, give evidence of greater antiquity. In 1594 their performance was prohibited by the Bishop of Mallorca, but they very likely survived this destructive attempt as the tradition has not been entirely lost.<sup>6</sup> Two fragments of a liturgical play dramatising the conversion of Mary Magdalen were discovered among papers taken

<sup>1</sup> H. Mérimée, *L'Art Dramatique à Valencia* (Toulouse, 1913), pp. 6 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 45 ff.

<sup>3</sup> This was the first play published by Juan Pie, 'Autos Sagramentals del sigle XIV', in the *Revista de la Asociación Artístico-Arqueológica Barcelonesa*, July-October, 1898.

<sup>4</sup> See Milá y Fontanals, pp. 218-21. The text is reproduced on pp. 341-7. An account of it by C. Vidal y Valenciano is also reprinted here as Appendix II, pp. 324-40. Cf. F. Pedrell, *La Festa d'Elche, ou le drame liturgique espagnol*, 1906.

<sup>5</sup> E. Juliá Martínez, 'Representaciones teatrales de carácter popular en la provincia de Castellón', in the *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* (1930), xvii, pp. 99-105.

<sup>6</sup> G. Liabrés, 'Repertorio de Consuetas representadas en las iglesias de Mallorca, siglos XV y XVI', in the *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos* (1901), v, pp. 920-7.

from a Mallorcan convent. The MS. is said to date from the fourteenth century, and the play, which is in the vernacular, appears to be quite an original work.<sup>1</sup>

The Corpus Christi procession eventually brought the liturgical drama out into the open, and the civic character of the procession (in Valencia the Bishop transferred its organisation to the municipal authorities in 1372) also freed it from the control of the clergy, and by making it a people's drama paved the way for the future *Auto Sacramental*. Nevertheless, the development was extremely slow. In England the full cycle of Miracle plays was complete by the fourteenth century. In the same century in Spain there were still no plays but only 'pageants'. There were two different lines of development, one Catalan and Valencian, the other Castilian and Andalusian. The former process of development can be seen most clearly in Valencia.<sup>2</sup> The procession was inaugurated in that city in 1355. It was composed of a series of pageants on carts drawn through the streets. These carts were called *entramesos*, later *roques*, and are first found mentioned in 1373. A document of 1400 refers to scenery on the carts and to musicians. The carts formed a series of tableaux, representing, among other things, St George and the Dragon, Jacob's Ladder, St Peter's Keys and Noah's Ark. At first and for many years the figures were statues, except that at times men were disguised as lions and other animals. It is not until 1400 and 1404 that we find these statues being replaced by men, who then sang some lines written for them. Rudimentary dramatic action was introduced in 1414, and by 1425 a few of these tableaux had at last become plays of some sort.

The words *entramés* and *representació* used of these spectacles has led many writers to presume that they were plays from the first. The actual development of the tableaux into plays can be seen in the three Valencian Miracles that have survived.<sup>3</sup> They are called *entramesos de peu or misteris*. The *Paradis terrenal*, the customary treatment of the Fall, is the development of the original tableau representing Adam and Eve. In 1404 there is mention of *tornar Adan e Eva*, which reveals that they were then no more than figures. Three years later the characters were represented by a man and a woman. By 1435 it is entitled *l'entramés del Paradis terrenal*, but it could only have presented action and dialogue

<sup>1</sup> The fragments together with a short study were published by J. M. Quadrado, who discovered them, in the Palma review *La Unidad Católica* (1871). This article was reprinted as Appendix 1 to Milá y Fontanals, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-23.

<sup>2</sup> Mérimée, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Mérimée, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 ff.; Milá y Fontanals, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-8. See also this latter work, pp. 231, 348-9, for two other Catalan fifteenth-century plays, dealing with miracles worked by St Vincent Ferrer, which survived through oral tradition and were printed in the eighteenth century.

of the most primitive kind, for it is not until 1517 that the list of actors corresponds to the text as we now know it. Its development did not cease there: by 1587 it had been considerably enlarged, and in 1654 it was still a *roca*. The 'St Christopher' is first referred to as one of the *roques* in 1451. There is no reason to think that it was then anything more than a statue of the Saint with the child Jesus. In 1527 the account books record a salary paid to a man for representing the Saint, but there is no mention of any other characters with whom he could have carried on a dialogue. In 1531 it is referred to as *l'entramés de peu de Sent Chripstofol*, and it would then have been a very simple play. It is not until 1553 that among the list of the *misteris* we find the *Cristofol ab sos pelegrins*. The appearance of the pilgrims for the first time gives us the full play as we now know it. It continued to expand: in 1587 salaries were paid to more than twenty actors who took part in it. The third play, the *Misteri de la Degolla*, is composed of three separate episodes: the adoration of the Magi, the flight into Egypt and the massacre of the Innocents. These had been three separate tableaux. The Magi are first referred to as a tableau in 1408, in 1432 Angels were added who sang some verse, in 1517 dialogue was introduced. The flight into Egypt appears as a tableau in 1451; it is not called a *misteri* until 1547, and only in 1587 has it the full number of actors required by the text as known to us. The Innocents formed a tableau earlier than 1404, by 1408 they had ceased to be statues, but Herod does not appear as a character until 1547 when the play is called a *misteri et representació*, and by that date it had been united with the *misteri* of the Magi. It must have been after 1587 that the trilogy was completed as in the extant text. It is evident, therefore, that real Miracle plays only came into being in Valencia between 1500 and 1550.

What is true of Valencia must be true also of Barcelona. Though the Corpus Christi procession was inaugurated there as early as 1322, *representacions* and *entramesos* are first mentioned in 1394. The whole organisation was on a much more lavish scale and the order of the procession<sup>1</sup> shows that the pageants far outnumbered those of Valencia. As there were in all 108 different *representacions* the procession must have been a magnificent spectacle. The subjects of the tableaux were arranged in historical order and formed one huge cycle that practically exhausted all the outstanding Old and New Testament scenes and characters, as well as the lives of all the local Saints. But how many of these eventually became plays is not known. A municipal document dated April 20, 1453, gives detailed instructions for the construction and arrangement of some

<sup>1</sup> Milá y Fontanals, *op. cit.*, Appendix VII, pp. 374-9.

of the *entremesos*, revealing considerable ingenuity and artistic sense, but it is evident from this document that none of these pageants can be called plays, though some of the characters sang. The *entramés appellat Bellem* reveals, however, the first step towards dramatic action consisting in the movement of characters, but there still seems to be no dialogue: *E en laltre porxo de part dreta stará la Maria agonollada, e en lo mig de la diferencia dels dits dos porxos stará lo infant Jesus tot nuu lensant raigs de si mateix vers lo qual infant los dits Maria e Josep segons dit es agenollats contemplarán. E los dessus dits angels cantarán gloria in excelsis. E de continent vinguen los III Reys qui munten per la porta del dit entramés, muntant per la scala que aquí farà lo dit mossen Çalom e adorarán l'infant Jesus.*<sup>1</sup>

The *representacions* of Valencia and Barcelona were therefore more than a century behind the English 'pageants'. It is likely that they would have followed the same ultimate line of development into a whole cycle of Miracle plays had not the new spirit of Europe brought with it altered conditions. The history of the *Auto Sacramental* might then have been different; but we must not look for its origins in Catalonia.

Backward as Catalonia was in comparison with France or England, it yet seems to have been in advance of the rest of Spain, a fact not at all surprising. In other cities the process of secularisation which finally produced the *Auto* was delayed for many years. Nothing is known of the Corpus Christi procession at Seville until the year 1454. There was then only one *roca* (in contrast to Barcelona's 108) which carried persons representing Christ, the Virgin, the four Evangelists, St Dominic and St Francis.<sup>2</sup> Plays are not mentioned until the following century, and it is here that we see the distinctive Spanish development of the future *Auto* in contrast to the more European development of the Catalan *Misteri*. Liturgical plays must have been performed in the cathedral in the fourteenth century, but they appear to have centred on the new feast of Corpus Christi. Though not connected with the recitation of the Office of the feast, they yet remained liturgical in the widest sense of the word in that they were regularly performed in the sanctuary as part of the service and not in the open. In 1579 a sumptuous catafalque was erected in the choir of the cathedral for ceremonies connected with the translation of the remains of sovereigns. This left no space for the performance of the plays, which were therefore acted in the west porch. This remained

<sup>1</sup> A. Balaguer, 'De las antiguas representaciones dramáticas y en especial dels entremesos catalans', in *El Calendari Català*, September 22, 1871, reprinted as Appendix VI to Milá y Fontanals, *op. cit.*, p. 369.

<sup>2</sup> J. Gestoso y Pérez, *La Fiesta del Corpus Christi en Sevilla* (Seville, 1910), p. 94.



the custom in succeeding years, until the plays found their way into the public squares where they were later exclusively performed <sup>1</sup> Here we have the Spanish *Auto Sacramental* as a development of the liturgical drama without the intermediate form of the Miracle play evolved from a 'pageant'. It was able to develop as it did because it was not hindered in Castile and Andalusia, as it would have been in Catalonia, by having as its parents a whole cycle of plays. The *Auto* is a distinctly Castilian production.

In other Andalusian cities the *Auto* followed the same lines of development. At Córdoba *autos* were produced in the cathedral to the accompaniment of music and dancing <sup>2</sup> Málaga witnessed the production of liturgical plays within its cathedral on Christmas night and Corpus Christi. Dances formed part of the Corpus Christi plays which were first performed in the cathedral and then again at various stages of the procession. In 1562 the Chapter decided that they should in future be performed in the Chapel of St Barbara and not in the choir. In 1574 they announced that all performances would henceforth be given in the porch.<sup>3</sup>

At Valladolid the church plays appear to have found their way earlier into the streets, since the Corpus Christi festivities all through the fifteenth century included *juegos* and *entremeses*. We have no clue as to the nature of these spectacles, but they may have been at least rudimentary *autos* since the method of their production foreshadows the future procedure at Madrid. The *carros* in the procession were in charge of the *oficios*, but under the supervision of the *corregidor* and the *regidores* who saw to it that they fulfilled their obligations. They continually insisted upon devout and edifying performances, decreeing in 1504: *que se han de hacer e se hagan los juegos e alegrías como mejor e mas debotamente se pueden hacer, no hazendo juegos torpes e sucios*. By 1541 the Municipality had already taken charge of the productions, and the gradual process of centralisation, which finally made Calderón the sole poet of the *autos* in Spain, begins to have effect in Valladolid in 1551, when the *regidores* summoned a professional actor-manager, one Alonso de Madrid, to superintend and *formalizar* the performances.<sup>4</sup>

This extraordinarily late development of the Spanish religious drama would lead one to suspect that the Morality type, so much in vogue in Europe in the fifteenth century, never appeared in Spain, or at most never had time to flourish before purely mediæval conditions had altered.

<sup>1</sup> J. Sánchez Arjona, *El Teatro en Sevilla* (Madrid, 1887), pp. 39-40.

<sup>2</sup> R. Ramírez de Arellano, *El Teatro en Córdoba* (Ciudad Real, 1912), pp. 19 ff.

<sup>3</sup> N. Díaz de Escovar, *El Teatro en Málaga* (Málaga, 1896), pp. 20-2.

<sup>4</sup> N. Alonso Cortés, 'El Teatro en Valladolid', in *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* (1917), iv, pp. 601-5.

This, in fact, was the case. No fully developed mediæval Morality has been discovered in Spain. The only example at all approaching this type of drama is the *Mascarón* of San Cucufate and Ripoll,<sup>1</sup> from Catalonia, as was to be expected. In this play the Devil accuses the Human Race before God the Judge, but loses his case when Our Lady appears as the prisoner's advocate. This allegory is very weak and primitive in comparison with a fully developed Morality. The clumsy and often childish allegory in the numerous sixteenth-century *autos* and *farsas* is a sure sign that allegory in drama must have been practically unknown in the preceding century. The first writer of Moralities is Gil Vicente in such plays as the *Auto da Alma*, the *Auto da Historia de Deos*, and more typically still in the trilogy of the *Barcas*. But it is not until Lope de Vega begins to write his *autos* that we find dramatic allegory developed to the extent common in the French *Moralités*, and we have to wait for the first of Calderón's 'philosophical' *autos*, *El Pleito Matrimonial del Cuerpo y el Alma*, before we really find any Spanish allegorical play rivaling the dramatic power of *Everyman*, although the latter was written a century and a half earlier.

The predilection for allegory is one of the most striking features of Italian influence upon Spanish literature in the fifteenth century, but this new fashion was a purely cultured taste and never spread to the people. It exercised no influence even upon those court poets who wrote religious plays. Gómez Manrique wrote two such plays when the fashion for allegory was at its height, but his plays are not Moralities, they are not really even Miracles, instead they are in the simplest liturgical tradition. His *Representación del Nacimiento de Nuestro Señor* is a simple but charming development of the *Pastores* type, and the *Lamentaciones hechas para Semana Santa* is a finished form of the original *Planctus Mariae*. These must obviously have been performed in a church or a private chapel. The liturgical drama had thus found its way into the palaces of the nobles. The Chronicle of Don Miguel Lucas, Constable of Castile, records that at Easter, 1461, a play of the Magi was acted in his palace at Jaén. Encina wrote Christmas and Easter plays for the Duke of Alba, and Gil Vicente did the same for the Portuguese court. Their plays are of the simplest liturgical type, but in their passage from church to palace (doubtless by way of the palace-chapel) they have undergone a curious transformation.<sup>2</sup> The Easter plays soon died out, but the

<sup>1</sup> See Milá y Fontanals, *op cit*, pp. 216-17.

<sup>2</sup> It would be beyond the scope of this article to describe this transformation. There is a most interesting and little-known study of this question by Arturo Graf, 'Il Mistero e le prime forme dell' auto sacro in Spagna', in *Studi Drammatici* (1878), pp. 251-325.

Christmas plays produced the *Autos del Nacimiento* cultivated by Lope de Vega, Valdivielso, Mira de Amescua, and Vélez de Guevara, but left untouched by Calderón except in his *auto El Tesoro Escondido*, a most original but remote development of this theme<sup>1</sup>

The transition from these early plays to the future *Auto Sacramental* is seen in the famous sixteenth-century *Códice de Autos Viejos* published by Rouanet. Here we find the definite introduction of allegory and consequently the first examples of belated Moralities, such plays are called *farsas*. We find also, for the first time in Castilian, plays that can be called Miracles, these are known as *autos*. The collection also contains some *farsas del sacramento* which are the purest type of *Autos Sacramentales* if the adjective *sacramental* be taken literally. These are developments of late fifteenth-century *loas* and *coloquios* peculiar to Castile and Andalusia, which were discussions on the Doctrine of the Real Presence and which were made to precede the performance of the *autos*,<sup>2</sup> supplying the 'sacramental' element and consequently the necessary connexion with the feast, a connexion required by the liturgical origin of the *auto*. These *farsas sacramentales* tended to die out—any serious insistence on the sacramental element would have strangled the young *auto*—but they survive with their original introductory function in Calderón's *loas*, which, apart from the conventional apotheosis at the close of most of his *autos*, are usually the only strictly sacramental part.

Even the best of critics have not been clear as to the early history of the *auto*. It is still commonly stated that there are two kinds, the *Auto del Nacimiento*, and the *Auto Sacramental*, the former being a development of the Miracle plays (*Misterios*), the latter of the Moralities.<sup>3</sup> This is too simple an explanation. It is evident that the Nativity *auto* is a direct survival of the earliest form of liturgical drama. The *Auto Sacramental* develops from a fusion of the sixteenth-century Miracles (*autos*,

<sup>1</sup> The Nativity plays seem to have survived in Calderón's time in different parts of the country. An example of one of these is the *Auto del Nacimiento de Cristo Nuestro Redentor* by Juan Francisco de Ustaroz, published in the *Revue Hispanique* (1929), LXXVI, pp. 346-9. It has almost as much simplicity of style and treatment as the Nativity plays of Encina.

<sup>2</sup> E. Cotarelo y Mori considered that the *Farsa Sacramental* by Hernán López de Yanguas, published in 1520 but probably written some years earlier, earns the distinction of being the first *Auto Sacramental* ('El Primer Auto Sacramental del Teatro Español y noticias de su Autor', in the *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos* (1902), VII, pp. 251-72). This is absurd. The *Auto Sacramental* was no new genre that suddenly sprang to life, but the gradual fusion of separate dramatic traditions, and it is impossible to point to this fusion as being first exemplified in any one particular play. The innovation of the 'sacramental' element, though a unique Spanish phenomenon, is the least important of these traditions. In any case, Sánchez Arjona published several *coloquios* considerably older than Yanguas' *Farsa* and no less 'sacramental'.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., A. Valbuena Prat, *Literatura Dramática Española* (Barcelona, 1930), pp. 15-16, A. Lacalle, Vélez de Guevara: *Autos* (Madrid, 1931), p. xi

themselves recently secularised liturgical plays) with the Moralities (*farsas*), owing its subject-matter chiefly to the former and its technique chiefly to the latter, and such direct 'sacramental' elements as it may possess to the *farsas del sacramento*, a peculiarly Spanish phenomenon. It is misleading to state that the *farsas* and not the early *autos* are alone representative of the *Auto Sacramental*. This is much too restrictive a use of the word *sacramental*, since it denies the later fully-formed *autos* any biblical or hagiological subject-matter, and thus overlooks the distinction regularly made by Calderón himself between *Auto sacramental alegórico* and *Auto historial alegórico*. This distinction of Calderón's applies simply to the nature of the theme, and it is unnecessary to point out that his *autos* of the second class are no less 'sacramental' than those of the first. It is true, however, that some of the *Autos Sacramentales*, and the most characteristic ones, are pure and highly developed Moralities. But others could only have arisen from a fusion of the Moralities with the Miracles, of the *farsas* with the *autos*. Allegory, which derives from the *farsas*, is the only feature which essentially distinguishes the *Auto Sacramental* from the *Comedia*, the question of length being really immaterial.<sup>1</sup> The *autos*, when left to themselves, produced the *comedras bíblicas* and the *comedias de santos*.

To conclude briefly. The survival of the mediæval church drama in Spain permitted it to achieve at the hands of Calderón a poetical and technical perfection denied it in other countries. This survival in an age when literature had become a conscious art is clearly to be attributed to the remarkable backwardness of its development in Spain, a point which has not been realised by historians of the early Spanish theatre. So primitive and rudimentary were the Miracles and Moralities in sixteenth-century Spain that they had not, as in France, fallen into a state of decay and consequent disrepute when professional and talented dramatists began to appear. Their artistic potentialities were still evident, and these dramatists therefore took over these simple plays and imbued them with a style and spirit that made them acceptable to the learned and cultured without estranging the sympathies of the humble by a lack of popular

<sup>1</sup> Even Ludwig Pfandl's historical conception of the *auto* is misleading, due to the belief, widely held but erroneous, that the *Auto Sacramental* is exclusively eucharistic in aim and character. He writes, for instance, of Timoneda's *autos*. 'Freilich ist auch hier der Anfang noch nicht Vollendung, und die Elemente des profanen und des allgemein religiösen Dramas vermischen sich mit jenen des eucharistischen solange, bis Calderon die reine und exklusive Form des *auto sacramental* geschaffen hat' (*Geschichte der spanischen National-literatur in ihrer Blütezeit* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1929), p. 120). It is precisely this *Vermischung* of these different elements, still crude in Timoneda, that produces the *Auto Sacramental*, and that lies essentially behind the construction of Calderón's *reine und exklusive Form* of the *auto*. This is a point that I hope to make clear in a detailed study of Calderón's *autos*.

appeal. These plays were also peculiarly suited to embody one of the great national ideals of the time—the struggle against the Reformation. For this reason as well as for the fact that it continued to draw its life from the people though it owed its form to the genius of cultured poets, the mediæval religious drama was able to become one of the most national manifestations of Spanish literature and, with Calderón, something splendid and unique in the history of the stage. But, apart from these ‘literary’ reasons for the survival of this type of drama, there is a ‘cultural’ reason which must not be overlooked, and which of itself might have achieved the same result, the fact, namely, that the Renaissance in Spain was never permitted to break with the traditions of mediæval life and culture, but, on the contrary, was so directed as to revivify them and make them bloom afresh.

ALEXANDER A. PARKER.

CAMBRIDGE.

## NOTKER'S ACCENTUATION SYSTEM IN HIS TRANSLATIONS OF ARISTOTLE'S 'CATE- GORIES' AND 'DE INTERPRETATIONE'

NOTKER's system of accents is the most important source of our knowledge of the length of the Old High German vowels and the accentuation of O.H.G. words. Despite this no exhaustive investigation of it has been made. Those who have devoted their attention to this subject have restricted their investigations to the accentuation system of the *Boethius*, which is commonly supposed to be the most regular and consistent. Scant notice has been taken of the other Notker MSS.

A full investigation of the accentuation system of the *Boethius* was given by O. Fleischer in the *Zs. f. d. Ph.*, xiv, pp. 129 ff. and 285 ff. Fleischer's article is in many respects faulty and inaccurate. It is firstly based on the older edition of Notker's works by Hattemer and often records as Notker's usage the many misprints of the editor. Later research, notably by Kelle, Sehrt and Starck, has shown that, even allowing for this, Fleischer's statements are often misleading, as, e.g., on the accentuation of the prepositions. Fleischer has, however, shown that variations in the accentuation system of the *Boethius* MS. are to be observed in the following cases:

- (i) in the indication of the secondary accent on compounds;
- (ii) in the accentuation of enclitic words such as the definite article, personal pronouns and prepositions,
- (iii) in the accentuation of the originally long suffixes and inflectional endings

Fleischer has attempted to discover principles governing the insertion or omission of the accents on these words and parts of words. In some cases he has succeeded in finding definite principles, whilst in others he simply records that Notker's usage must have varied. With regard to the accentuation of the inflectional endings Fleischer's remarks are unreliable, as he merely repeats an older article by Braune.<sup>1</sup> Braune based his conclusions on the quite insufficient evidence of the first 30 pages of Hattemer's edition of Notker's *Boethius*, and, as has already been shown by Kelle,<sup>2</sup> many of them are not borne out by the later parts of the *Boethius*.

<sup>1</sup> Braune, *Über die Quantität der althochdeutschen Endsilben* (P.B.B., II, 125 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> J. Kelle, *Das Verbum und Nomen in Notker's Boethius* (Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, Phil.-Hist. Classe, cix, pp. 229 ff.).

Fleischer assumes that the principles, which explain the variations in the accentuation of certain words and syllables, are not due to the scribes altering the consistent use of the accents by Notker, but are to be ascribed to Notker himself, and he has been followed in this with certain restrictions by Sehrt and Starck in their recent edition of the first two books of *Boethius*.<sup>1</sup> They have corrected the MS. when these principles are not observed. A contrary view is taken by Kelle,<sup>2</sup> who has investigated the quantity of certain suffixes and the inflectional endings. Kelle is of the opinion that, even when some principle is perceptible, it is due to the scribes and that the quantity of the vowels did not vary in Notker's language.<sup>3</sup> It seems that the question cannot be decided simply from a consideration of the *Boethius* MS. The object of the present article is to investigate the accentuation system of the MSS. of Notker's translations of the *Categories* and *De Interpretatione*, and to compare it with the results arrived at by Fleischer. In this way it may be possible to find out how Notker did actually accentuate various words and syllables, and, if the principles found in the *Boethius* by Fleischer also govern the accentuation in the Aristotelian writings, they can hardly be due to scribes. It is possible too, that a full investigation of Notker's accentuation system may reveal a development of Notker's system, and this may be used in an attempt to determine the chronology of Notker's works. Fleischer has already noted differences in the accentuation of the first two books of *Boethius*, as compared with the remainder of that text, whilst Braune commented on the differences between the *Boethius* and the *Psalms*, and within the Aristotelean writings themselves. The conclusion, which Fleischer and Braune drew from these differences, that the works ascribed to Notker are the work of more than one translator, has been proved by Kelle, on the basis of the declensions and conjugations and vocabulary, to be wrong and is now generally abandoned. If these differences are shown not to be the work of scribes, the only conclusion which can be drawn is that Notker's own accentuation system varied during the course of his work.

Notker's translation of the *Categories* is found in two MSS., partly in St Gall 825 (A), the same MS. as contains the *Boethius* but by different hands, and entire in St Gall 818 (B). The latter also contains the *De Inter-*

<sup>1</sup> *Alteutsche Textbibliothek*, No 32.

<sup>2</sup> Kelle, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Kelle, p. 236: 'Das Fehlen des Langezeichens neben dem Erhalten desselben beweist nicht, dass sich die Quantität einzelner Endsilben bei Notker schon abzuschwächen begonnen hat. Es geht daraus nur hervor, dass der Schreiber Aufmerksamkeit mitunter auch hinsichtlich der Accente erlahmte. Für die durch Unachtsamkeit entstandene Verschiedenheit in der Accentuierung der Flexions wie Ableitungssilben ist daher ein Gesetz weder zu finden, noch auch zu suchen'.

*pretatrone*.<sup>1</sup> Neither of the two MSS. is a copy of the other, but both go back to a common original,<sup>2</sup> and although they are often individually faulty, the incorrect accents of either of them may be corrected by a collation of the two MSS. It is first necessary to determine how far these MSS. can be relied on and how they compare with the *Boethius*. For this purpose a comparison has been made between the first two books of the *Boethius* and the *Categories*, which are about equal in quantity. An account of the faulty accents in the *Boethius* has already been given by Braune, Fleischer and Kelle, but their results are unreliable, as they are based on the obsolete edition by Hattemer. In the following account only the faulty main accents are considered, as the omission of the secondary accent from compounds, suffixes and endings may not be a mistake. The omission of an accent from the prepositions, personal pronouns, and definite article is also not considered at the moment as faulty.

The accent is omitted in the *Boethius* I and II 47 times <sup>3</sup> *ter* (pronoun) 16, 8, 24, 20, *solichero* 39, 1, *ding* 41, 20; *festes* 10, 12, *recche* 16, 6, *uusta* 18, 20; *gehaba* 24, 5, *hohiu* 24, 19, *turre* 24, 19, *geuualtgên* 24, 23; *mîn* 31, 6; *zechendi* 32, 5, *vilo* 31, 4; *ist* 36, 16; 95, 9, *verno* 50, 7, *habêst* 54, 17, *luzzel* 58, 5; *rehto* 58, 10; *heb man* 61, 10; *nu* 62, 18; *ube* 63, 3; 87, 20, *kehaben* 65, 2, *unde* 30, 13; 66, 30, 99, 14, *geuualt* 67, 20, *Taz* (pronoun) 68, 13; *al* 71, 5; *sus* 73, 6; *spiloman* 78, 14; *chad* 79, 10, *nemag* 81, 17; *geslagena* 81, 26; *saligen* 82, 23, *uuarma* 87, 10; *heiz* 87, 12; *mere* 87, 16; *so* 87, 22, *gezug* 102, 11; *bedarf* 103, 26, *bezeren* 109, 12; *frewuest* 125, 28; *manige* 129, 11, *dunchet* 124, 28

The acute accent is placed instead of the circumflex 10 times: *dîe* 13, 5; *irrôtende* 14, 7; *lâchennas* 17, 9, *bisa* 19, 8, *sia* 19, 17; *brâhta* 22, 12; *ïoman* 31, 18; *kerûobôn* 42, 3, *tia* 64, 15, *sêlo* 128, 4.

The circumflex is placed instead of the acute 13 times: *begôndôn* 5, 8; *uûas* 10, 11; *sîgelôsen* 25, 13; *uuîrfzâueles* 27, 11; *fînfstûnt* 38, 20, *sîne-uuelbe* 52, 19, *trôumda* 69, 10; *dîh* 71, 15, *êr* 74, 14; *lêbêt* 89, 23; *sînfliuot* 113, 4; *dîu* 93, 24; *mânige* 123, 30.

The accent is wrongly placed on an unstressed prefix once *nêuuêist* 54, 3.

This makes a total of 71 errors in this part of the *Boethius* alone.

In that part of the *Cat.* common to A and B (Piper, I, pp 367-477) the accent is omitted in both MSS. 31 times: *unde* 373, 10; 375, 5, 379, 10;

<sup>1</sup> Each of these two MSS. is written by more than one scribe, but it may be said at once that the variations in the accentuation system within each MS. do not coincide with the changes of the writers as described by Piper, *Zs. f. d. Ph.*, XIII, pp 305 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Steimmeyer, *Zs. f. d. A.*, XVII, p 431.

<sup>3</sup> The references to the *Boethius* are from Sehrt and Starck's edition (*loc. cit.*), for the remainder of Notker's works to Piper's edition.



379, 20, 380, 29, 385, 1; 385, 24; 389, 29, 390, 14; 393, 24; 394, 12; 406, 8; *sint* 375, 10; 425, 14; *herôsta* 379, 5, *hartor* 382, 16; *alde* 384, 25, 393, 23, *nehabyt* 386, 3; *dia* (pronoun) 389, 15, 393, 16; *Tes* 393, 25, *ube* 395, 2, *neuuehselônt* 395, 29, *zuer* 396, 11, *Taz* 398, 4, *zesamene* 399, 26, *also* 400, 12; 370, 6, *tie* 400, 19, *verit* 438, 13.

The acute is placed instead of the circumflex 12 times *die* 377, 9, 377, 10; 377, 13, 379, 17, 380, 9, 380, 10; 386, 30, 436, 6, *rôtendêr* 456, 22, *dia* 400, 6, 400, 9, 439, 27.

The circumflex instead of the acute 8 times *dîu* 370, 11, 402, 17, *triugt* 396, 9, *ên* 397, 27; *nehêrn* 397, 27, *sâmo* 425, 4, *eîna* 432, 13 A (B *ema*); *hêrn* 454, 13

The accent placed on an unstressed prefix once *ûnvêruêhselôt* 395, 28

The total number of incorrect accents is 52, and of these 30 are accounted for by the omission of the accent on the conj *unde* or by the wrong accent on the demonstrative pronoun and definite article. It should also be noted that of these 52 incorrect accents 44 occur at the beginning of the *Cat.* on pp 367–406 (Piper), and that only 8 incorrect accents are found in the remaining 51 pages. It is evident that the accentuation becomes much more careful from about p 407.

The accentuation of the *Cat.* is therefore no less accurate than that of the *Boethius*, and there is no reason why this work should not be used to determine the principles of Notker's accentuation as well as the *Boethius* MS.

Taken individually the two MSS. of the *Cat.* are very faulty. Stem-meyer has already shown that the text of A is more correct than B and the same applies to the accentuation. It is unnecessary to record the mistakes of each MS., but to give some idea of the difference between the two, it might be mentioned that A omits the accent from the root syllable of the nouns only 8 times, whilst B omits it 30 times. A, however, often incorrectly has a circumflex on the diphthong *ei*, where B has the correct acute.

With regard to the accentuation of *De Interpret.* it has already been noticed by Braune (*loc. cit.*) that the accentuation becomes very scanty particularly on the suffixes and endings from about the beginning of Book IV. The omission of an accent from this part does not prove anything and in the following account only Books I–III are considered (Piper, pp. 499–535). Even within this part pp 179–80 of the MS. (Piper, pp. 529, 19–531, 6) contain many errors and omissions and can only be used with considerable caution.

In the following investigation the method adopted is to determine the

principle of the accentuation from the cases in which A and B agree. The variations between the MSS. are then quoted. The accentuation of that part of the *Cat.* which is in B only and of *De Interpret* is quoted only when there is any doubt about the principles and when the principles determined from the *Cat.* differ from those of the *Boethius*.

#### A. THE MAIN STRESS.

The majority of simple words in Notker's works bear at least one accent, which stands regularly on the root syllable of the word. There are, however, a number of words which can be used enclitically and the accent on these varies in the Notker MSS. They are.

##### (i) *The prepositions.*

The prepositions of more than one syllable and *durch* are always accented in the *Boethius* and the *Cat.*, the number of exceptions being so small and obviously due to carelessness, that they need not be recorded.

With regard to the prep. *an* Fleischer has noted that it is accented when standing before an unstressed definite article, but before a stressed word *an* is sometimes accented and sometimes left without accent in the *Boethius* MS. Fleischer was unable to recognise any principle governing the accentuation of this word. He points out, however, that *an* is always accented before the personal pronouns. This latter remark has already been shown to be incorrect by Sehrt and Starck<sup>1</sup> According to them there are 7 examples of *an* before the personal pronoun and 14 of *án*. In the *Cat.* the position is quite different. Both MSS. agree in accenting *an* regardless of the character of the following word. The exceptions in both MSS. are so few that they can be quoted in full *an diu* 376, 26; *An érdo* 383, 3, *an síh* 397, 12; *an diên énden* 402, 11. The accent is omitted by A 4 times where B has it. *an demo únderen* 375, 9; *an uuélemo* 408, 11; *An primis* 437, 23, *an mángên* 438, 14. The accent is also omitted by B 5 times where A inserts it *an démo* 367, 6; *an ín* 423, 17, *an téle* 438, 5; *an éteuemo* 450, 25; *an demo corpore* 459, 3.

In *De Interpret.* the accent is omitted only 4 times (499, 5, 503, 7, 523, 10; 532, 10). There is therefore no doubt that the principle in these MSS. is that *an* like most of the other prepositions bore the accent.

Fleischer has recognised that with very few exceptions the preposition *in* is accented only before an unstressed definite article, unaccented before a stressed word. This principle is followed consistently in the *Cat.*, the

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. xiii.

only exceptions in both MSS. being. (a) *in dien* 379, 16; 379, 19, *in in* 382, 4, *in éinándérên* 435, 4, *in iro zálo* 436, 14, *in imo* 453, 17, (b) *in demo dorf* 413, 14. There are also a few variations between the two MSS., but they are so slight that they need not be recorded. Fleischer's principle is therefore established and any variations should be corrected in a critical edition of Notker's works.

The prep. *ze* and *be* are consistently unaccented in the *Boethius* and the *Cat*. The former also appears in the fuller adverbial form *zuo* or *zu*, and Fleischer remarks (p. 142) that these too are without accent in the *Boethius*. This is quite incorrect. The prep. appears in this text in the following forms *zálo* 10 times, *zuo* once (35, 9), *zúze* 3 times, *zú* twice, *zu* 15 times. The *Boethius* shows, therefore, no regularity in the accenting of this prep. In the *Cat* and *De Interpret* the prep. appears only twice without accent (440, 26, 470, 9), compared with a large number of examples of the accented form. Again the principle in the *Cat.* is that this prep was stressed, and the *Cat.* are again more consistent than the *Boethius*.

Fleischer also considers that the prep. *mit* was left unaccented by Notker in adverbial phrases, such as *mit réhte*, although examples are found even there of the accented prep. The prep. is never left without accent in both MSS. of the *Cat.* together, although B, the more careless MS, omits it occasionally, but only once (370, 21 *mit réhte*) in an adverbial phrase.

#### (ii) *The personal pronouns.*

Even in Modern German it would be impossible to find any consistent principle for the accentuation of the personal pronouns, as the stress on these words is largely of a rhetorical nature. Some pronouns are, however, by their very nature, stressless, such as the Modern German *es*. In Notker the pronoun *iz*, the gen. *is* and the plural *siu* are only accented in the *Boethius* according to Sehrt and Starck (p. xiii) when they appear at the head of a sentence or of a conjunctionless subordinate sentence. The same principle is followed in the *Cat.* in the accentuation of *iz* and *is*, but not in that of *siu*. There are only 2 examples of the omission of the accent at the head of a sentence, one in A (375, 16) and one in B (480, 5). When *iz* does not stand at the head of the sentence, it is not accented except in 5 cases in both MSS., where it has the stress (373, 10; 393, 12; 412, 5; 432, 32; 450, 6). In MS. B, however, from pp. 433-69 (Piper) there are a large number of examples in which *iz* in this position is provided with an accent. These are certainly mistakes and should not be repr.<sup>2e</sup>

duced in a critical edition of the *Cat.*<sup>1</sup> The accentuation of this pronoun in *De Interpret.* is in agreement with the other texts

The accentuation of the pronoun *su* in the *Cat.* differs from that of the *Boethius*. In both texts *su* is accented at the head of the sentence. In the *Boethius* it is not accented in other positions, whilst in the *Cat.* the pronoun has the accent in both MSS. 69 times, omitting it 12 times. In the remaining cases where the MSS. vary, B is usually the one which omits the accent (20 times), whilst A omits it only 4 times. Taking A, the more careful MS., as the standard, the accent is inserted 79 times, omitted 16 times. The implications of this difference between the *Cat.* and the *Boethius* will be discussed later.<sup>2</sup> *De Interpret.* casts no new light on the question of the accentuation of *su*. There are there 5 examples of *suu* and 8 of *suu*. It is evident that Notker's principle has been considerably mutilated by the various scribes.

The same principle which governs the accentuation of *iz* is also followed in the accentuation of *man* and its compounds *ïoman*, *nïoman*. Occasionally one or the other of the MSS. fails to observe the rule but never both MSS. together.

For the nom. case of the other personal pronouns Fleischer has formulated the rule that they are only accented when they stand at the head of a sentence and when they translate a stressed Latin pronoun. They are unaccented when they follow the verb or a subordinating conjunction. Sehrt and Starck have, however, already pointed out (p. xiii) that there are so many exceptions to this rule, which Fleischer has not quoted, that it is impossible to determine what was the principle followed by Notker. In the *Cat.* the pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person, sing. and plural, are never left without accent in both MSS. together. The accent on *ih* is omitted only once by A (430, 5) and on *uuir* once by B (410, 23). The accent on *dû* is omitted 3 times in B only (382, 25, 394, 23, 409, 15). In the *Cat.* therefore these pronouns are accented, whatever their position in the sentence may be, and the few deviations from this rule are due to carelessness. *De Interpret.* is less careful in the accentuation of these pronouns, although the accent is inserted more frequently than it is omitted.

With regard to the pronouns *er*, *si* and the plural *sie* Sehrt and Starck

<sup>1</sup> How uncritical Piper's edition is, is shown especially by his treatment of the accents. He prints in the text all the examples of the accented *iz* from B, despite the fact that they are in contradiction to the whole of A and the *Boethius* as well as the remainder of B.

<sup>2</sup> It should be mentioned here that the accents on this and other words are often erased at the beginning of MS. B, probably by a person other than the scribe. Many of the erasures are from root syllables of full words and are therefore faulty. The principle on which the corrector worked is not recognisable, and the erasures are ignored in this article.

simply remark that they appear both with and without the accent in *Boethius*. No principle can be discovered except the one stated by Fleischer, which is doubtful. In the *Cat.* and *De Interpret.* the fem *si* is normally accented with the circumflex, there being only 5 examples of the unaccented form (431, 17, 476, 5, 476, 15, 476, 16, 476, 17). Of these 4 occur on one page and are obviously mistakes. Again these texts accent the word consistently, whilst the *Boethius* varies. The variations between the two MSS in the accentuation of *ei* and *sie* are, however, so considerable that no principle is recognisable, except that they are always accented at the beginning of the sentence.

Despite the considerable variations in the *Boethius* Sehrt and Starck are of the opinion that the oblique cases of the pronouns were always accented by Notker. This is probably correct, as again the accentuation is more consistent in the *Cat.* and *De Interpret.*, the following being the only exceptions in both MSS.: *in* (masc. acc.) 433, 5, *in* (dat. pl.) 426, 15. The accent is also omitted by A 456, 9 and by B 423, 17; 427, 2; 439, 27. *imo* is never without accent in both MSS. together. A omits 432, 4, B 388, 3; 437, 8, 485, 1. *únsih* is accented without exception. In 3 cases (442, 28; 465, 18 A, 494, 14 B) the word is accented on both syllables (*únsih*). This is simply a mistake probably due to confusion with *sih* and not to be explained with Scherer (*Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, p. 81) and Fleischer (p. 297) as a remnant of Aryan accentuation, or with Lachmann (*Kl. Schriften*, I, p. 379) from the enclitic use of the pronoun, similar to Greek *ἐοί* for *ἐοι*. *uns*, *mih*, *dih* are also always accented. On the other hand *dir* is not accented, although there is only one example in the *Cat.* (467, 2) and 4 in *De Interpret.* (502, 2; 503, 17; 511, 21; 513, 12). Neither Fleischer nor Sehrt and Starck give any information on the accentuation of this pronoun in *Boethius*. Actually it appears there both with and without accent. Also they do not discuss the accentuation of *sih* and the fem. *sia*. The former never appears without accent in both MSS of the *Cat.* and in *De Interpret.*, although B omits the accent 4 times (395, 29; 399, 13, 457, 28, 490, 5). The accentuation of *sia* varies. Both MSS. have *sia* 5 times and *sia* also 5 times.

Summing up the principles of the accentuation of the pronouns in the *Cat.*, it appears that all pronouns are accented at the beginning of the sentence. *iz*, *is* and *man* are not accented in other positions. The pronouns *ih*, *dú*, *uir*, *mih*, *úns*, *únsih*, *imo*, *in*, (acc. sing. and dat. pl.) *iro*, *dih* and *si* are always accented. *su* is usually accented. *dir* is left without accent, although there are but few examples. The accentuation of *er*, *sie*, *sia* varies.

(iii) *The demonstrative pronoun and definite article.*

The definite article in German arose from the demonstrative pronoun, and in the older periods of the language retained much of its demonstrative character. In Notker's prose it often bears the accent like the pronoun. Some of the conditions under which it is accented in the *Boethius* have been determined by Fleischer and Sehrt and Starck. Fleischer found that the def. art. was always accented in the following cases

(a) When preceding a noun with a dependent genitive. This rule is observed in the *Cat.* although there are 11 exceptions which must be considered as mistakes.

(b) Before *selb.* This rule is again observed in the *Cat.* with one exception, *ter selbo modus* 474, 23.

(c) Before cardinal numbers. The same rule is again followed in the *Cat.* with 2 exceptions (483, 11 B; 534, 5), both being dependent genitives, explained by the fact that two rules cross each other. As shown below, the dependent genitive is not accented.

(d) In certain adverbial phrases such as in *dia uuisa*. Again the *Cat.* and *De Interpret.* agree with *Boethius*.

(e) Fleischer formulated the rule that the article was accented before a noun which is the antecedent of a relative pronoun, the only exceptions being a number of cases where there was no relative sentence in the Latin text corresponding to the German relative. Sehrt and Starck have already pointed out (p. xi) that the Latin text could hardly influence the accentuation of a word in the German text, and have recognised that the def. art. is accented in the *Boethius* only when it precedes a noun which is the antecedent of an essential relative sentence, without which the sentence would be incomplete. With 2 exceptions (367, 14, 458, 11) this rule is observed in the *Cat.* and must therefore be ascribed to Notker himself. There are more exceptions in *De Interpret.* but all except two (502, 20; 502, 21) are explained by various rules clashing with each other.

The article is left without accent under the following conditions:

(a) Before and after *ein*. In by far the majority of cases this rule is observed in the *Cat.* Both MSS. have the accent only in 5 cases (386, 10; 431, 28; 401, 2, 431, 26, 432, 13). Of these the last 3 have an essential relative following, where the two principles conflict with each other. MS. B and *De Interpret.* have the accented form in a large number of cases, but owing to the agreement between *Boethius* and *Cat.* A these can only be regarded as mistakes.

(b) After *al* There are only 3 examples of the art. in this position in the texts under consideration. In 2 of them (377, 6, 382, 8) the article is without accent in A. The third *állu diu ánderu* (410, 10) is accented in both MSS, which may be explained by the fact that the phrase is the antecedent of an essential relative. In 377, 6 *álle die skidunga dés óberin generis* B has the accent on the art., following the rule that it is accented before a noun with a dependent genitive. There is therefore nothing in the *Cat* which conflicts with the rule obtained from the *Boethius*.

(c) Before *ander* and ordinal numbers. MS. A of the *Cat* again agrees with this, whilst B, as before *ein*, often places the accent on the article. Both MSS have the accented article only in 410, 10, 452, 1; 453, 3; 458, 10, which have a dependent genitive, 440, 28, which is followed by an essential relative, 423, 3 *die ánderen zuêne*, which is influenced by the rule that the art. is accented before cardinal numbers. One other exception *án dien ánderên relativis substantis* 429, 25 cannot be explained by the various principles clashing with each other.

(d) Before an attributive genitive. This rule is not followed strictly in the *Cat*. Taking firstly those cases in which both MSS. agree, we find that *des* is accented 7 times, not accented 30 times. A accents a further 5 times, where B omits, and B twice where A has no accent. In the part of the text in B alone *des* is never accented. In *De Interpret.* *des* is accented once (508, 25), twice without accent (504, 7, 505, 26). The divergence from the system in *Boethius* is still greater in the accentuation of the plural *dero*. It appears with the accent in both MSS. 23 times, without 18 times. A has the accent a further 6 times, B a further 3 times. In the part in B alone there are 5 examples of *dero*, one of *déro* (485, 18). In *De Interpret.* *dero* 9 times, *déro* twice (501, 8; 515, 19). The insertion or omission of the accent does not appear to follow any recognisable principle and it must be assumed that the MSS. of the *Cat.* are faulty in this respect.

(e) Before superlatives. This rule, too, is not observed in the *Cat.* as the article appears there both with and without accent. In view of the theory discussed later, it is important to note in which forms the def. art. appears with the accent. The accent is omitted in both MSS. *daz* 394, 1; *die* 384, 9; 459, 19, *diu* 373, 3; 378, 7. The accent is inserted *diu* 374, 17; 378, 6; 379, 5; 379, 8; 386, 3; *die* 379, 17, *téro* 382, 19. In the part in B alone *der* 488, 1; in 384, 7 *tien* the accent is erased in B and omitted by A.

Neither Fleischer nor Sehrt and Starck give any information on the accentuation of the article in cases not covered by the above principles.

It is clear, however, from the *Boethius* that the article was only accented when it had demonstrative force, often referring back to some noun already mentioned. In the *Cat* this principle is not observed strictly, but is in conflict with an evident tendency to accent regularly those forms of the article which have a heavier vowel. For instance, *der*, *daz*, *den* are only accented when the word has demonstrative force, whilst *diu*, *dien*, *dîe* are accented in a large number of instances where no demonstrative force is perceptible. In both MSS. *diu* is stressed 37 times, unstressed only 12 times, *dien* accented 23 times, unaccented only 3 times. Also if the exceptions to the principles discussed above are examined, it will be found that they consist usually of the article in these three forms (cf. especially the accentuation of the article before superlatives and ordinals). The implications of this will be discussed later.

(iv) *The enclitic dar-*

Fleischer gives (p 148) a number of rules followed in the *Boethius* for the accentuation of the demonstrative adverb *dar*, *dara* compounded with prepositions. It appears that *dar* and *dara* were accented when they had demonstrative force, unaccented when they merely supported the preposition. There is no trace of this difference in the *Cat*. There the word is consistently accented regardless of its particular meaning. The only exceptions to this are *tarûz* 399, 23; *tarâna* 408, 10. In *De Interpret.* the word is accented 10 times, unaccented 3 times (*tarâna* 501, 5, *tarazû* 508, 5; *taranâh* 529, 4).

(v) *The enclitic sô.*

This consistently appears in the unaccented form in the *Boethius* and *Cat*. in such phrases as *so uir*, *sâmoso*, etc. There are a few exceptions in the *Cat*. which may be regarded as mistakes: *sôuûârâna* 373, 8, *sôuûêlche* 456, 14; 464, 10, *sôuûêderiz* 488, 10 B. In the same way *âlsô* appears in *Boethius* without accent on the second part. The *Cat*. are not consistent in the accentuation of this word, *âlsô* and *âlsô* appearing in about equal proportions. In 2 cases (370, 6; 400, 12) both accents are omitted. *De Interpret.* agrees with the *Boethius*, there being only one example of *âlsô* 523, 22.

## B. THE SECONDARY ACCENT.

In addition to marking the main accent on the root syllable of the word, Notker also marked the secondary accent on certain compounds, long suffixes and inflectional endings. In the *Boethius* these secondary accents are, however, not consistently inserted, and Fleischer is of the



opinion that the accent was withdrawn from the originally long suffixes when they were followed by a long inflectional ending, causing a shortening of the suffix vowel. According to him the quantity of the suffix vowels varied therefore in Notker's language. Before this question can be considered, it is necessary to determine the quantity of the inflectional endings. Unfortunately Fleischer neglected to do this, relying on the results arrived at by Braune on the insufficient basis of the first 30 pages of *Boethius*, and his conclusions require revision in some cases. The following endings are normally marked as long in *Boethius* and the *Cat.*.

-ên of the 1st plural, pres. ind. There are only 3 exceptions in the *Cat.*: *infînden* 454, 14, *hêrzen* 457, 21, 466, 27.

The subjunctive endings -êst, -ên, -ênt without exception.

-êr of the nom. sing. masc. of the adj. There are 2 exceptions in the *Cat.*: *gelêidegoter* 457, 28, *gezôhter* 479, 23 B. In *De Interpret.*: *êner* 529, 19, *ânderer* 529, 20 in the badly accented part.

-ên of the dat. pl. of the adj. Exceptions: *sînen* 374, 8; *ûndertânen* 385, 5; *ânderen* 394, 13; *âllen sîbenen* 418, 3, *sêlben* 431, 2, *getânen* 433, 24, *dîsen* 464, 2; *widerwârtîgen* 486, 3 B; *émânderen* 491, 18 B. In *De Interpret.*: *ênhen* 503, 3, *misselîchen* 521, 4, *mânîgen* 529, 28.

-ôn of the gen. and dat. pl. of the *ô* and *n* stems. The accent is never omitted in both MSS. together. Omitted by A in the adv. *uûilon* 370, 1 and *vôrhton* 456, 23; by B *uûilon* 369, 19; 482, 24; *lîrnûngon* 487, 10; *rêdon* 487, 10; *uûison* 489, 4. In *De Interpret.*: *hêrton* 528, 16; *gebûredon* 534, 19; *uûilon* 534, 21 (twice).

The endings -îst, -în, -înt of the past subj. The accent is omitted in both MSS.: *uûârin* 382, 9, 382, 10; *zegîengîn* 436, 8; *êgîn* 452, 14. Omitted further by A *uûûrtîn* 474, 15; by B *uûârin* 436, 8; *êgîn* 411, 27. In *De Interpret.* the accent is omitted twice in the badly accented part. *uûûrtîn* 350, 23; *sôltîn* 530, 22.

-ân of the fem. *n* stems. The accent is omitted in both MSS.: *gesprôchemun* 400, 10; *in diutiscun* 400, 13; *îdun* 402, 20, 403, 1. Further omitted by A *sêlbun* 463, 13; and by B *sêlbun* 487, 17. In *De Interpret.* the accent is omitted twice in the faulty part. *fôresâgun* 530, 1; 530, 4.

There is no doubt that these endings were long in Notker's language. The number of exceptions in each case is insignificant compared with the number of cases where the vowel is marked as long.

The quantity of the endings not protected by a consonant is, however, doubtful and it is possible that their quantity fluctuated in Notker's language. The endings in question are: -a of the nom. and acc. pl. of the fem. *ô* stems. As Kelle has already shown, Fleischer's statement (p. 157),

that this ending was usually short in the *Boethius*, is incorrect. In that text *a* is found 23 times and *â* 90 times, and Kelle assumes that the accent was incorrectly omitted in the 23 cases by the scribes. In this he has been followed by Sehrt and Starck who have consistently put the accent on the vowel in their edition of *Boethius*. In both MSS. of the *Cat* *a* appears 21 times, *â* only 7 times (*hábâ* 451, 5, 463, 25, *strázâ* 403, 13; 403, 15, *ánavállungâ* 452, 4; *fárewuâ* 472, 13, *stúngedâ* 458, 5). Further B has the accent twice, where A omits (*fárewuâ* 455, 4, 455, 22). In *De Interpret* *a* appears 3 times (*sprâcha* 500, 22; *vóresága* 534, 11, *gebureda* 534, 12), *â* also 3 times (*ságâ* 516, 12, 516, 24, *uwiderchétâ* 522, 30). In view of this no safe conclusion can be drawn about the quantity of this ending in Notker.

-i of the 1st and 3rd sing past subj. In the *Boethius* this ending was usually left without accent. According to Fleischer (p. 161) the proportion is *i* 86 times: *î* 19 times. Kelle assumes that the accented forms are dialectal peculiarities of the scribes and that the vowel was short in Notker's language. Where the two MSS. of the *Cat*. coincide we find *i* only 3 times (*hábeti* 434, 32; 476, 15; *rúhti* 387, 12). The accented form *î* appears 5 times (*máhtî* 374, 6, 374, 7, 434, 31, 436, 15; *hábetî* 387, 12). In that part of the *Cat*. in B only there are only 2 examples of the ending both without accent (*sóliti* 492, 11, 492, 17). In *De Interpret*. *î* appears 5 times (*máchôtî* 510, 18; *ságetî* 522, 8, *máhtî* 527, 10; 532, 5, 532, 7). The ending appears without accent 4 times all from the faulty part (*sóliti* 530, 18; 530, 20; *vóreságeti* 530, 9, *verságeti* 530, 9). To conclude from this that the vowel was consistently unaccented in Notker, as Kelle has done, is unjustifiable. It seems much more likely that the quantity varied under conditions which can no longer be determined.

-i of the fem abstracts. As Kelle has already shown, Fleischer's statement that this ending was as frequently accented in the *Boethius* as left without accent is incorrect. The proportions are about the same as the subj. ending *i* discussed above. Kelle assumes, therefore, that in Notker's language the ending was short. The *Cat*. agree with this. The vowel is accented there 28 times in both MSS; unaccented 82 times. The number of exceptions is, however, considerable and it is not safe to draw any conclusions as to the length of the ending in Notker's usage.

-u of the nom. sing. fem. and nom. and acc. pl. neuter of the adj. This is the only diphthong forming an inflectional ending in Notker and as such should be accented. Fleischer has shown (p. 137) that it is usually marked with the acute in the *Boethius*, although there are a few exceptions mostly in common words as *álliu*, *dísu*, *énnu*, *béridu*. The MSS. of the *Cat*. deviate considerably from this. There the word *béidiu* is only

twice marked with the accent on the ending (400, 21; 484, 28 B). This word was already petrified and used regardless of the gender of the following word. Many other common words appear consistently without the accent in both MSS. *·énru*; *énru*, all numerals (except *vieru* 378, 10 B which incorrectly has the ^); *disru* (except 474, 23 and 3 times in B · 453, 12; 481, 17, 481, 22); *súmu*, *sinnu*, *sólu* (except 421, 26); *állu* (except 5 times in B and 2 in A, but never with the accent in both MSS. together). With regard to other words both A and B show a surprising change from p 407 onwards. Up to p 406 there is only one example of the accented diphthong in both MSS. together (*énlúzziu* 377, 26), and the accent on this is erased in B, compared with 41 examples of the unaccented ending. The MSS. vary only in the following cases: *gemerniu* 403, 18 A, *súmelichû* 371, 25 A, in which the accent is placed on the wrong syllable, and *ándériu* 384, 2 A. From p 407 to the end A has 23 examples of *iu* and 33 of *iu*, whilst B has *iu* 43 times and *iu* 21 times. It is clear that the MSS. of the *Cat.* are unreliable in this particular, but it cannot be due to chance that both MSS. begin to place the accent on the ending at the same point. It must be assumed that the accent was missing in this part of their common source, possibly because it was written by a scribe in whose dialect the diphthong *iu* was contracted, as it certainly was in Otfrid (cf. *guatu*, *ellu* etc.) It has already been noted that most of the faulty root syllable accents common to A and B occur at the beginning (pp. 367–406), whilst very few are found in the later part. From p. 407 onwards the common source of A and B had the accent on the *iu*, and of these more are retained by B than by A. The accentuation of *De Interpret.* agrees with the last part of B. There *iu* is found 30 times and *iu* 13. It must be assumed that the texts under consideration are faulty in the accentuation of this ending, and that the *Boethius* has preserved Notker's usage.

All other endings are short and left without accent. The following are faulty in both MSS. of the *Cat.*: *geuâren* 434, 29; *gehéizena* 434, 26; *dâhtâ* 434, 12; *mâhtâ* 434, 12 (all on one page); *zû demo feruârenên* 405, 5; *michelâ uuîzn* 410, 21; *sinnelôsê* 457, 14; *gelichô* 454, 26; *ôftô* 455, 2; 455, 7; *nâhô* 459, 6. *uuêlê*s 408, 12 is not an incorrect accent, as the long vowel has arisen from a contraction from *uuêlehes*. The long ending was then transferred to the uncontracted forms: *sôlehês* 427, 5 A (B *solchês*), *sôleês* 455, 12 B (A incorrectly *sôleês*).

We are now in a position to consider the accentuation of the suffixes and the possibility of any variation in the quantity of these suffixes, when they were followed by inflectional endings:

(a) *-ôr* of the comparative and *-ôst* of the superlative. According to Fleischer (p 166) these suffixes are long when the adjective is uninflected; before a short ending the quantity varies, but is usually long; before a long ending the suffix is not accented and Fleischer concludes that in this case the accent was withdrawn from the ending on to the inflectional ending. With this the accentuation of the *Cat.* does not agree. The suffixes are there consistently marked as long regardless of the following vowel. There are only two exceptions: *hartor* 382, 16 where the accent is also omitted from the root vowel, and *hóor* 459, 12, which is possibly explained by the fact that the two vowels come together. In *De Interpret.* there are no examples of the suffixes followed by long endings. In other cases they are always marked with the accent.

(b) *-lih*. According to Fleischer this suffix is only accented in the *Boethius* when it is uninflected, except in the words *uuelih* and *sólih* which are never marked with the accent. Despite the number of exceptions, which are not inconsiderable, Sehrt and Starck are so convinced that Fleischer's principle was actually the practice of Notker, that they have normalised the *Boethius* according to it. Again this principle is not observed in the *Cat.* There *-lih* is consistently marked with the circumflex in the uninflected form with no exceptions in both MSS. together. B omits the accent twice: *súmelih* 377, 12; *ételih* 471, 2. In the inflected form the accent is also normally inserted, only being omitted in both MSS. 5 times (*uuiolichu* 449, 4, *uuioliche* 449, 5, *uuiolichina* 456, 28; *natúrlichu* 455, 18; *állelichu* 473, 8), compared with 51 cases in which the accent is inserted in both MSS. The accent is further omitted by A: *súmelichû* 371, 25, *súmelichuu* 422, 15, *súmeliche* 398, 29; by B. *uuiolichi* 390, 27, *natúrlichu* 433, 28; *gesiuulichû* 436, 19 (accent on the wrong syllable). In that part of the *Cat.* in B alone the accent is inserted 19 times, omitted twice. *natúrlichu* 489, 16; *ánderlichôra* 492, 28. In *De Interpret.* the accent is omitted only 3 times: *natúrlichu* 503, 16; 508, 22, *únállelechûn* 518, 5. There is no doubt, therefore, that this suffix was accented in the Aristotelean writings regardless of the following ending.

(c) *-ig*. Fleischer again shows that this suffix was shortened in the *Boethius* when followed by a long inflectional ending, and sometimes also when followed by a short ending. In the *Cat.* this suffix is consistently accented in the uninflected form except the word *mánig*, which is always left without accent, inflected or uninflected. There are also a few examples of the unaccented suffix in one or the other of the MSS. but never in the two together. When the suffix is followed by a short inflectional ending, both MSS. agree in marking it with the accent 38 times. The

suffix is unmarked only 4 times: *ánanémiga* 397, 3, *scúldigen* 430, 19, *únsþúetigo* 452, 31, *spúetigo* 456, 15. There are also 2 cases where the accent is placed on the wrong syllable *uiðeruuártigî* 416, 15, *zórnmúotigî* 457, 10. When the MSS. vary A omits *zúhtiga* 424, 12, *zórnmúotige* 457, 13, B omits *súnderiga* 367, 17, *uiðeruuártigis* 412, 10. Before a long ending the accent is inserted in both MSS. 6 times (*uiðeruuártigru* 394, 3, 394, 8, 394, 16, *mérstigên* 433, 12, *gesihtigru* 436, 25, *stétigên* 455, 23). The accent is omitted 10 times (*missenámigru* 371, 18, *uiðeruuártigôn* 397, 3; *mérstigên* 434, 4; *mérstigiû* 434, 5, *uiwingôra* 449, 16, *uiwingên* 455, 24, *únsinnigîna* 457, 18; *ábólgigêr* 458, 2; *hábmáhtigôn* 473, 14, *chánnigôro* 463, 29). When the MSS. vary A has the accent: *mánignámigru* 371, 16, *uiðeruuártigru* 469, 5, B has the accent: *îligêr* 461, 2. In that part in B alone there is only one example of the suffix followed by a long ending and this has the accent. *uiðeruuártigên* 485, 24. In *De Interpret* the suffix appears only once without accent before a long ending (*uiðerchétigûn* 518, 19), compared with 4 examples of the unshortened suffix. It is true that in these texts the accent is omitted as often as it is inserted, but it is not proved from the *Cat.* that the suffix is shortened before a long ending, and we must simply record a variation in the MSS. which allows no strict principle to be recognised. Sehart and Starck have further pointed out (p. xv) that *-ig* is often left without accent in uninflected words after a short root syllable in accordance with the principle that a secondary accent is not often borne by a syllable immediately following a short one. There is not the slightest trace of this in the *Cat.*

(d) The suffix *-ô* of the *-ôn* verbs. This suffix is marked with the circumflex in the *Boethius*, except when followed by a long inflectional ending. In the *Cat.* the ending does not appear to have any effect on the suffix vowel. It is marked as long in both MSS. 7 times: *geuissôtên* 412, 12, *úngeuuehselôtiu* 396, 5; *gevétachôtêr* 428, 16; *vertîlgôtên* 431, 25; 432, 12; *gelêrdegôtêr* 457, 28; *geêbenôtiu* 471, 14. The accent is omitted only 4 times: *guissotôn* 392, 11; *neuuehseloên* 396, 18 (where the two vowels come together); *geskidotiu* 466, 18, 466, 19. The proportion of unaccented suffixes before a long ending (7:4) is not much greater than before a short ending (9:3) and the quantity of the final vowel does not appear to be of any consequence.

(e) The suffix *-ê* of the *-ên* verbs. In the treatment of this suffix the *Boethius* and the *Cat.* agree. The suffix vowel is of weaker quality than the *ô* suffix and is more susceptible to the influence of other syllables in the word. In both texts it is shortened when followed by an inflectional

ending, long or short. There are a few exceptions in both MSS. of the *Cat.* where the suffix is shortened even in the uninflected form: *versuûget* 393, 25, *gelirnet* 411, 27, and 3 cases where the long vowel is kept even before an inflectional ending. *ságênne* 464, 21, 469, 2, *vrágênne* 437, 20. In *De Interpret.* this principle does not appear to be observed, although there are only 2 examples. *lósênnis* 507, 6, *vrágêntemo* 513, 1.

(f) Fleischer has shown that the suffixes *-haft* and *-falt* are often unaccented in the *Boethius* when a long ending follows. They do not appear in the inflected form in the *Cat.*, so that the principle cannot be confirmed by the usage there. The accent is omitted only once: *zuivalt* 469, 4.

There are a number of other suffixes which are not usually followed by long endings, and others, the suffix vowel of which is so weighty that it does not easily lose its quantity.

(g) The suffix *-are*. Fleischer remarks (p. 162) that this suffix is accented and unaccented in the *Boethius* in about equal proportions. This, however, has been shown by Kelle (p. 282) to be wrong. Actually the proportions are *-are* 31 times, *-äre* 11 times, and Kelle claimed that the suffix was short in Notker's language, the accents having been wrongly inserted by the scribes. In this he is followed by Sehrt and Starck, who have normalised the *Boethius* on this principle. Again the *Cat.* differ. *-äre* is found 4 times, always with the circumflex in A, whilst the accent is once omitted by B. The examples are: *máchârra* 454, 15, *gramátrichäre* 459, 26 A, *vêhtârra* 460, 20; *ringârra* 460, 20. The number of examples are but few, but it should be noted that the suffix appears consistently long in other Notker MSS. such as that of *De Syllogismis*. Kelle's conclusion appears to be unsafe and we are certainly not justified in removing the accents on the evidence of the *Boethius* alone.

(h) The adv. suffix *-ân*. This suffix is normally but not consistently marked with the circumflex in the *Boethius*. The accentuation is more regular in the *Cat.* where the suffix appears only once without accent: *uúánnan* 423, 21.

(i) The adv. suffix *-êst* is always long in the *Boethius* and the *Cat.*

(j) *-heit*. The *Boethius* shows no ascertainable principle in the accentuation of this suffix (Fleischer, p. 163). In the *Cat.* it never appears without accent in both MSS.

(k) *-lôs*. The suffix is accented with very few exceptions in *Boethius*. It never appears without accent in both MSS. of the *Cat.*

(l) *-niss*. According to Fleischer *niss* is only accented in the first half of the *Boethius* and even there not consistently. It does not occur fre-

quently in the *Cat*, but is only left without accent in both MSS once: *gelihnisse* 367, 12, compared with 4 examples of the accented form. It is more frequent in *De Interpret.* where it appears 10 times always with the accent.

(m) The suffix *-tūom* is accented in the *Boethius* with one exception. It only occurs once in the *Cat* and there has the accent: *rīhtūm* 472, 19.

(n) *-unga* This suffix appears both with and without accent in the *Boethius* following no recognisable principle. No principle is observable in the *Cat*. The suffix appears in both MSS. 8 times with the accent and 17 times without. B has the accent in a further 4 cases where A omits it. In that part of the *Cat*. in B only the suffix is accented 7 times and left without accent only once (*māchunga* 489, 19). In *De Interpret* it is accented 9 times and unaccented 4 times. As the same words appear both with and without accent it is clear that the scribes have mutilated whatever principle was employed by Notker.

Taking this group of suffixes as a whole it is evident that in the *Cat* the originally long suffixes are consistently marked with the circumflex. Fleischer's principle that the long suffix vowel is shortened and unaccented, when followed by a long inflectional ending, does not hold good of the *Cat.* and *De Interpret.* No shortening takes place in *-lih*, *-ôr*, *-ôst*, *-lôs*. The suffix *-ô* is unaccented only 4 times. The suffix *-îg* shows more examples of the unaccented form before a long ending, but not before a short ending as in the *Boethius*, and there is certainly no trace of the rule suggested by Sehrt and Starck that the suffix is unaccented in the uninflected form following a short root syllable. In addition the suffixes *-héit*, *-âre*, *-niss* are consistently accented in the *Cat.* whilst the *Boethius* varies. The almost complete agreement of A and B in this respect shows that the accentuation of these suffixes cannot be due to the scribes of A and B, and there is no reason why these two MSS. should not be an equally accurate reflection of Notker's practice as the single *Boethius* MS. The difference between the *Cat.* and the *Boethius* might be formulated thus: In the *Cat.* the long suffixes are marked with the accent, whether they bear the secondary stress in the word or not. In the *Cat.* the accents are therefore signs of the length of the vowel. In the *Boethius*, as far as can be seen from MS. A, the originally long suffixes are only accented when they bear the secondary stress in the word. Hence the omission of the accent when the suffixes are followed by long inflectional endings on to which the secondary stress of the word was drawn. It follows from this that the accents in the *Boethius* are not only signs of the length of the vowel but also indications of the relative stresses in the word. The

difference between an accented suffix and an unaccented one (e.g. *-lih* and *-lih*) is not simply one of quantity but of stress. Otherwise, why were *-lih* etc. not marked with the acute like the other short suffixes, *-niss* and *-unga*? This principle explains, too, the omission of the accent on the pronouns in the *Boethius* when used enclitically, on certain enclitic adverbs such as *so* and *dar*, on the article without demonstrative force, and on the prepositions when used before stressed words. Obviously the difference between *án* and *an* is not a difference of quantity. In the *Cat* on the other hand only faint traces of the beginnings of an indication of stress are discernible. As already remarked the long suffixes are consistently accented regardless of the stress. The personal pronouns *ih*, *dú*, *uir*, *sê*, *sin* are accented whether they are used enclitically or not, although the stress principle is seen in the treatment of *iz* and *man*. In the same way in the *Cat*. no traces of a stress principle are observable in the accentuation of *án*, *mit*, and the enclitic *dâr*. Also it has already been noted that in the *Cat*. the heavier forms of the definite article such as *dîu*, *dîen*, *dîe* are accented even when they have no demonstrative force, although traces of the stress principle are found in the accentuation of the shorter forms. All this pointing in the same direction cannot be the senseless work of scribes who failed to understand the niceties of Notker's practice. It is more probable that a change in Notker's system has taken place. At the beginning of his work Notker regarded the accents as signs of length, later he combined this with an attempt to indicate the relative stresses in the word. Only the beginnings of this second principle are to be traced in the *Cat*. If this reasoning is correct, it follows that the *Cat* and *De Interpret* are earlier than the *Boethius* in its present form. As is well known, Notker himself said in a letter to the Bishop of Sitten that he began by translating the *Boethius*, and this cannot reasonably be doubted. But it has already been suggested by Ochs,<sup>1</sup> on the basis of the treatment of the Anlautsgesetz in Notker's works, that the text of *Boethius* A is a revision of the earlier translation made subsequent to the *Cat*., and that a fragment of the original version is preserved in the Zurich MS. D of the *Boethius*. Although the evidence of the Anlautsgesetz is disputed by some scholars, there is no doubt that MS. D is nearer to the original Latin text than *Boethius* A (cf. Sehrt and Starck, p. vi). If Ochs' theory is correct, MS. D should agree with the *Cat*. in the particulars of the accentuation discussed above. Unfortunately in this fragment, which is but small, very many accents are omitted, even those on root syllables, so that the omission of an

<sup>1</sup> Ochs, *Zweierlei Notker* (P.B.B., xxxviii, pp. 354 ff.).



accent cannot prove anything. Much more important, however, are those cases where D inserts an accent contrary to *Boethius* A. Even in this small fragment we find accents on the suffixes when followed by a vowel *samınthafıgun* 189, 11, *innıglıcha* 190, 3; *gıotuuıllıgen* (dat pl) 195, 8, accents on the pronouns, even when used enclitically. *pındıst tı* 191, 3; on *sı* 192, 5, 192, 11; 193, 2, 193, 4; 193, 5. These accents are more in accordance with the system found in the *Cat* than that of *Boethius* A and this supports the conclusion, arrived at by Ochs by other methods, that the text of *Boethius* A is later than that of the *Cat* and a revision of the text of *Boethius* D.

#### THE ACCENTUATION OF COMPOUNDS

Normally in the *Cat.* both parts of compound words are marked with an accent, except the inseparable prefixes *be-*, *fer-*, *ge-* etc.<sup>1</sup> In the *Boethius* the second part of the compound is frequently left unaccented, especially in the compounds of adverb and noun or verb (Fleischer, p. 293). In such cases the accent is omitted only 5 times in the *Cat* *uıderuuartıg* 391, 28; *uıderuuartıgu* 394, 3; 394, 16, *uıderuuartıges* 396, 25; *óbenahıgemo* 403, 15. The compounds with the prefix *un-* normally have the accent on the prefix in *Boethius* and *Cat*. The accent is omitted in both MSS. of the *Cat* only in *unsámfto* (449, 21), in which the accent on *un* is erased in A and omitted by B; *unmáhtıg* 453, 1. The second part of the compound is unmarked in about one-sixth of the examples in *Boethius*. Fleischer again points out (p. 287) that the accent is omitted when the second part has a long inflectional ending (*únerón*, *únsaldá*, *únsalıg*). There are no traces in the *Cat.* of an omission of the accent under these conditions, but there are a number of other cases where the accent is omitted. In most of these the compound with *un-* is used in close proximity to the same adjective or noun without the prefix. It may be that the accent is omitted because the prefix bears a strong stress, or simply because the accentuation of the word has been indicated immediately before. Fleischer quotes (p. 286) a number of similar instances from the *Boethius* without indicating any reason for them. Examples from the *Cat.* are *mánıg únde únmanıg* 412, 20; *gelıh únde úngelıh* 465, 12; *únebenemo únde ébenemo* 471, 18 (this example seems to disprove the theory that the accent is omitted because it has already occurred once); *réhı nók únrehı* 472, 32; *réhı únde únrehı* 485, 17 B, 486, 2 B etc. There are very few cases which are not covered by

<sup>1</sup> MS. A often has the accent on *fer* which can only be regarded as a mistake, e.g. 406, 6; 439, 6; 452, 27, 462, 3; 476, 10 etc.

this rule. The accent is omitted in both MSS. *ungehaftiu* 458, 29 (with faulty accentuation of the ending), *ungemeina* 367, 25, *inspaltig* 390, 10

The compounds with *ur-*. In the *Boethius* the second part is often unaccented. In the *Cat* *urspringe* 391, 22; *urguse* 484, 7 B, *uréiche* 392, 1, without accent *uréiche* 392, 13; 397, 16; 465, 4.

The compounds with the prefix *â-*. In the majority of examples from *Boethius* the second part is unaccented. In the *Cat*. the examples are *âchustin* 426, 12, *âgezelen* 451, 9, but *âbôlgugêr* 458, 2. Also there are a number of compounds in the *Boethius* with *sêlb-*, *âl-*, *uulle-* and numerals as the first part, in which the accent is omitted on the second part (Fleischer, p. 296). In the *Cat* compounds with *sêlb-* and *uulle-* are not found, those with *âl-* are never left without accent on the second part. The compounds with numerals are normally accented on both parts, although there are a few exceptions: *zuibeine* 376, 26, 432, 5, *driscosis* 464, 10 (but *driscôze* 464, 12), *driortêr* 464, 6 (but *vierôrtêr* in the same line); *éinluzziu* 375, 4; *éinluzze* 390, 10. In 375, 10 *einlûzzén* is a mistake.

The compound *eteuuaz*. The accentuation of this word in the *Boethius* varies. In by far the majority of cases in the *Cat* the word is accented on both parts. The exceptions are *éteuues* 438, 8, 438, 11, 438, 19; 438, 26 all on one page and clearly a mistake, *éteuuno* 399, 5, *éteuuer* 392, 8, *éteuuiu* 377, 28.

*iouuht* and *nîouuiht* are unaccented on the second part in the *Boethius*, which indicates according to Fleischer, that the second part was stressless. In the *Cat* the second part is never left without accent. Again the stress principle does not apply to this text.

*Other words*. The accentuation of the original compound *lîchamo* varies both in the *Boethius* and *Cat*. In the latter text it is unaccented in both MSS. 5 times, accented twice. *lîchamin* 388, 15; 471, 9 A.

*nôtmez*. The second part of this word seems to have become a suffix as it is normally unaccented (Fleischer p. 295). Examples from the *Cat.*: *genôtmezôt* 439, 31, *nôtmez* 464, 24; 464, 11 A; 464, 13 A (in the last two cases B has *nôtméz*). With the accent in both MSS. *knôtmézôt* 411, 5.

*fétâch*. The simple word has the ^ in 428, 7; 428, 8 A, 428, 11 A, 428, 13 B, 428, 19; 428, 19; 428, 24; 428, 25 B. The accent is omitted in both MSS. in the derivative verb: *geuêttachôtêr* 428, 16, *keuêttachôta* 428, 25; *geuêttachôt* 428, 26.

CHARLES T. CARR.

ST. ANDREWS.

## MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

### ENGLISH GEOGRAPHY IN MALORY'S 'MORTE D'ARTHUR'.

'Fanciful enough', Sir Edward Strachey declared the geography of Malory's *Morte D'Arthur*,<sup>1</sup> and later students have seemingly been content to let the matter go at that. But although one may admit that the geography is certainly hazy, nevertheless it is frequently more clearly defined than that of its sources. Scattered throughout the twenty-one books, the numerous localisations make little impression; collected, they become noticeable. A dozen English towns either appear for the first time in Arthurian romance, or are cited as the scenes of occurrences not previously located. Malory, for instance, consistently identifies Camelot with Winchester.<sup>2</sup> He several times definitely locates events in London.<sup>3</sup> In addition he introduces references to Sandwich, Carlisle, Windsor, Westminster, Dover, Guildford, Arundel, Alnwick, Bamborough and Canterbury.<sup>4</sup> To Cornwall and Northumberland, the traditional counties of the romances, he adds Sussex, Kent, Surrey, Essex, Norfolk and Suffolk.<sup>5</sup> He mentions also the rivers Thames and Trent, Sherwood Forest and St Paul's Cathedral in London.<sup>6</sup>

So far as I have been able to determine, these particular topical references are not to be found in previous versions of the story. Some of them may of course be taken from now lost redactions to which Malory had access. These were, however, most likely in French, and there is little possibility that a 'Frensshe booke' would pay much attention to English local colour. In any case references ranging from the first to the last books of the *Morte* can certainly not in any great proportion be explained by supposititious lost manuscripts.

Local tradition may also have aided Malory's imagination. This is likely in the case of Winchester which, then as now, displayed the Round Table. It is possible also in the attempt to locate Joyous Gard: 'Some men say it was anwyk & somme may say it was hamburow' (xxi, 12). I feel personally, however, that Malory would have had difficulty in producing these 'some men', other than a certain Sir Thomas Malory of

<sup>1</sup> See *Le Morte Darthur*, Globe Edition, xv.

<sup>2</sup> See II, 19, XII, 10, XVIII, 8. Sir Edward Strachey's statement in his introduction to the Globe Edition of the *Morte* that Malory once (II, 1) 'seems to connect Camelot with Avelon, or Glastonbury' appears to me unwarranted; the mention, however, of 'a castle, called Camelot', instead of a city, may show that at this early stage of his narrative Malory had not certainly identified Camelot and Winchester in his mind.

<sup>3</sup> See I, 3, 4, 5, 7; II, 1.

<sup>4</sup> See XX, 16; XII, 14, XX, 16, XVIII, 2; XVIII, 4, 19, XIX, 4, I, 11, XVIII, 8; X, 23; XXI, 12; XXI, 12, I, 6, 9, 10.

See X, 23; XXI, 3.

<sup>6</sup> See XVIII, 19, 20; I, 7, 11; I, 17; I, 3, 4, 5.

Warwickshire. Be this as it may, it makes little difference from the point of view of literary treatment, for whether from personal or traditional sources the attempt at identification shows the author's interest in localising his scene.

The reason for these topical references, which may in many cases be very definitely made out, throws some interesting light upon both Malory's literary methods and aims, and his personal character. He was translating and reworking the Arthurian story for Englishmen of the fifteenth century, and his geographical references show that he felt himself to be rescuing the story not only from the French language but also from the fog of myth which had enveloped what was, presumably, to Malory the figure of a true English monarch. At the opening of his second book, for instance, for the benefit of the reader who might be confused by the number of kings appearing, he writes, with no suggestion from his sources: 'For there were many kynges within the realme of Englonde and in Walys Scotland and Cornewaille'. At the opening of Book VIII he elucidates even further upon this point.

And at that tyme kynge Arthur regned and he was hole kynge of Englonde walys and Scotland & of many other royaumes how be it there were many kynges that were lordes of many countreyes but all they held their landes of kynge Arthur / for in walys were two kynges and in the north were many kynges / And in cornewail and in the west were two kynges / also in Irland were two or three kynges and all were under the obeissaunce of kynge Arthur.

These are, it seems to me, distinct attempts to explain the situation for the benefit of a reader accustomed to one king for England and Wales, who would doubtless be confused by mention of many kings just as, I remember, I was when reading the story as a child.

The same rationalising process appears in two of King Arthur's campaigns, for Sir Thomas, an old soldier, seems to have had an eye for strategy, and thought doubtless that his readers did too. Arthur's war against the northern kings (I, 8 ff.) is in the source quite unintelligible. From Malory's account, however, its strategy can be clearly enough made out. King Arthur, not strong enough to take the offensive, withdraws behind the line of the Trent, and establishes there a cavalry patrol to keep out spies and raiders. Just north of the river he holds an outpost—the castle of Bedegraine, located in Sherwood Forest<sup>1</sup> The enemy advances and lays siege to Bedegraine, whereupon Arthur now reinforced by the troops of Ban and Bors crosses the Trent and fights in Sherwood a decisive battle in relief of his besieged fortress.

Malory's attempt to identify Joyous Gard (*v.s.*) is also based strategi-

<sup>1</sup> I have been unable to locate in the Sherwood district any place-name suggestive of Bedegraine.

cally, for the sources indicate that Arthur in his war against Launcelot operated from Carlisle. Launcelot is therefore logically placed in opposition in Northumberland.

Malory's identification of Astolat, home of the Lily Maid, with Guildford, the unromantic county-town of Surrey, is one which has always puzzled readers.<sup>1</sup> One reason is certainly geographical possibility. In the *Mort Artu* and in the stanzaic *Morte Arthure* the unsteered boat floats from an unlocalised Astolat to an unlocalised Camelot down a nameless river—a type of voyage common enough in mediæval romance, but hardly convincing to the reason. Malory, however, locates the court at Westminster, and consistently names the river as the Thames (xviii, 19, 20), he also has Elaine give directions that her body shall be carried in 'a charyot unto the next place where Temse is' (xviii, 19), and that a steersman shall be supplied. Guildford, only thirteen miles from the Thames at Chertsey, is thus a convenient place, and the voyage of a steered boat from Chertsey to Westminster offers no difficulty. Malory has in this manner transformed the voyage of a magical boat into an entirely realistic occurrence.

Reading, Newbury, or any other town on or near the upper Thames would, however, have satisfied the geographical requirements just as well, so that a more particular reason for the selection of Guildford is to be sought. This can be found in the general situation at the beginning of Book xviii.<sup>2</sup> The court at that time is located at Westminster (chaps. 6, 8); Arthur, however, has announcement made of a tournament to be held at Camelot, here particularly noted as Winchester (chap. 8). One morning Arthur with most of the court departs from Westminster, and apparently that night lodges 'in a Towne called Astolat / that is now in Englyssh called Gylford' (*ibid.*). Launcelot, having his good-byes to say to Guinevere, departs later, but by hard riding also comes to Astolat for the night. Astolat, in Malory's mind, therefore, would have to be located on the London-Winchester road, a day's ride from London. Guildford, twenty-eight miles from London by the present road, satisfies these requirements. Moreover, at Astolat the King lay at the castle; Guildford also was the seat of a royal castle at which a king might naturally lodge when on a journey. In Malory's time the residential portions of Guildford Castle were

<sup>1</sup> Professor Rhys in *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*, 1891, p. 328, attempts to explain the occurrence of Guildford by connecting it with Galafort, a castle mentioned in one of the Grail romances. The association seems too slight, and so far as I have been able to determine, this explanation has not met with favour.

<sup>2</sup> I am indebted to my colleague, Professor J. S. P. Tatlock, for a suggestion in this connexion.

already in a runous condition,<sup>1</sup> and for that very reason could probably be all the more readily associated with the ancient times of Arthur.

Two interesting negative cases also support the theory that Malory was interested in giving his readers English local colour. As the scene of the sword stuck in the block of stone (I, 3, 4, 5) he mentions 'the grettest church of london', and then adds, 'Whether it were Powlis or not the Frensshe booke maketh no mencyon'. Evidently he would have been glad to be informed on this matter and to pass the information on.

Book XIX, chap. 4, also begins with an interesting passage 'Thenne sir Launcelot rode as fast as he myghte / and the book saith / he took the water at Westmynstre brydge / & made his hors to swymme ouer Temse unto lambehythe'. The introduction of 'the book saith' seems to me significant, for Malory was writing when armour was at its heaviest and when for a 'mare's son' to swim Thames with an armoured knight on his back would have been the rankest of impossibilities. The book says it, let the book take the responsibility; Sir Thomas will not himself attempt to foist upon his readers any such fish story. Exactly what the book said can unfortunately not be known, for this is one of the few parts of Malory's work for which no source or analogue seems to be known.

While these topical references frequently make matters appear more reasonable to his reader, they also in other cases seem to be merely the result of Malory's own personal experiences. Mr Hicks has commented upon some of these and pointed out that the *Morte* like other mediæval writings sometimes shows the reflection of the author's own life. He has, for instance, made good use of two passages which indicate that Malory was working upon his book during his long term of imprisonment,<sup>2</sup> and has also pointed out the passage in which Malory laments the fickleness of Englishmen and their readiness to revolt from their king.<sup>3</sup> He has, however, made rather less of this last than might be, for the passage seems to me an obvious case in which Malory let his loyalty to the House of Lancaster display itself in his writing.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See G. C. Williamson, *Guildford Castle*, published by the Corporation of Guildford, 1926, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> See Edward Hicks, *Sir Thomas Malory*, 1928, pp. 84, 85.

<sup>3</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup> Malory's Lancastrianism is shown to be likely by Hicks (chap. XIII), and seems to be accepted by Kittredge in his preface to the volume (p. ix). Another 'personal' passage in the *Morte* should be noted here, although it contains no geographical references.

'And many complayntes were made unto sir Arthur of grete wronges that were done syn the dethe of kyng Uther / of many londes that were bereued lordes knyghtes / ladyes and gentilmen / wherfor Kynge Arthur maade the londes to be even ageyne to them that oughte hem.'

Since Malory was at his death legally landless (Hicks, p. 73) and since he almost certainly must have considered himself wronged, this addition to the sources looks like a personal touch.

A geographical reference which is probably the result of Malory's own feelings is to be found in Book xx, chap. 2, in which, when commenting upon Agravaine's companions who in such dastardly fashion set upon Launcelot, Malory on his own responsibility writes 'al they were of Scotland outhur of Syr Gawayns kynne / outhurwel willers to his brethren'. The reference to Scotland may well be the result of a patriotic Englishman's attempt to shift from his own countrymen the responsibility for a treacherous and villainous deed.

Malory's natural interest in the civil wars and his allegiance to the House of Lancaster show in several of his localisations. The place, for example, at which Uther defeated the rebels was in the sources nameless, but Malory states (I, 3) that it was St Albans—an obvious insertion when we remember that during the years when the *Morte* was most likely being composed an English king twice at St Albans faced the spears of a rebel host.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly the identification of Magouns and Arundel may have a relation to the political situation. Malory states:

But ever she [Anglides] drewe southward to the see syde / tyl by fortune she came to a castel that is called Magouns / & now hit is called Arundel in southsex

(x, 33.)

The direction of Anglides's flight 'southward to the see syde' is Malory's addition, and is a good detail of local colour, since it is just the route one would have to take from Cornwall to arrive at Arundel, four miles from the Channel coast. This castle of Magouns, at which she arrived, had moreover in one respect at least an evil reputation because from it came 'certain traitors' who set upon the good knight Sir Tristram (x, 50). In the fifteenth century, from a Lancastrian's point of view, Arundel also was the seat of certain traitors, being a holding of the Fitz-Alans, notorious Yorkists.

The most extreme case, however, in which Malory let his anti-Yorkist feelings run away with Arthurian tradition, is in the composition of Modred's army (xxi, 3). Writers from Geoffrey of Monmouth down had been well agreed that Modred gained his strength by allying to himself various heathen nations such as the Picts and the Saxons. Malory, however, does not mention these at all, but on the contrary declares:

Thenne syr Modred areysed moche peple aboute london / for they of Kente Southsex and Surrey / Estsex and of Southfolke and Northfolk held the most party with sir Modred.

<sup>1</sup> The battles at St Albans were in 1455 and 1461. The former year, if the suggestion given above is correct, would seem to offer a date after which we must place the beginning of the composition of the *Morte*. I see no means of determining which engagement Malory had in mind. The battle with a rebel *northern* army suggests that of 1455, the king's victory, that of 1461. After the second battle the association would of course be doubly strong.

The association of the south-east with a traitor's cause corresponds precisely with the situation in the Wars of the Roses, for in this district, historians agree, lay the strength of the Yorkists.<sup>1</sup>

Malory's introduction of local colour serves thus on the one hand to make the story more intelligible to the reader, and on the other, to give vent to his own vigorous feelings. In both cases it tends to show him as an original writer rather than as a translator and compiler.<sup>2</sup>

GEORGE R. STEWART, JR.

BERKELEY, U.S.A.

#### PRINTED BOOKS WITH GABRIEL HARVEY'S AUTOGRAPH OR MS. NOTES.

I have still to record some additions to my list, most of them kindly sent me by Mr W. A. Jackson.

1599. Hill's 'Schoole of Skil'. 'Some Unnoted Harvey Marginalia' were supplied by Mr C. Camden, Jr., to the *Philological Quarterly* (April, 1934), XIII, pp. 214-18.

1549. 'Aristotelis de Arte Dicendi libri tres' (the title first given in Greek). Parisiis apud Vascovanum. The Greek text. Apparently has on the title-page 'L<sup>b</sup> Thomæ Browne', and immediately underneath in Harvey's hand 'Dedit Gabrieli Harveio 1572', and lower down 'Gabriels Harvey'. The marginalia, in the first book only, are almost all in Greek. The book belongs to the Earl of Leicester, Holkham, Norfolk, and was brought to Mr Jackson's notice by the kindness of Mr C. W. James.

The following two Harvey books were found by Mr Jackson in the library of Sir R. Leicester Harmsworth, Bart., at Bexhill-on-Sea:

1571. Foxe (John). 'De Christo crucifixo Concio.' Apud J. Dayum, Londinium. 4<sup>o</sup> (the Brand Heber Britwell copy).

1588. Harvey (John). 'A discursive problem concerning propheties.' J. Jackson for R. Watkins. 4<sup>o</sup>. Leighton sale 1919, no. 1245. Inscribed 'Ex dono Jo. Harvey' with Gabriel Harvey's signature.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., William Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England*, III, pp. 180-1.

<sup>2</sup> Since the original presentation of this study before the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast (1929), Nellie Slayton Aurner's 'Sir Thomas Malory—Historian?' has appeared (*P.M.L.A.*, June 1933). This article notes some of the details of which I had already independently made use. The point of view is, however, different.



## THE OLD ENGLISH WORD 'SÆTILCAS'.

In the passage

. cepa ne seah  
ofer eargeblond ellendne wearod  
[ne] huru ymbe sc[ip]hergas s(æ)tilcas ne herdon  
(Boethius, Metra VIII, 1 29-31)

the word *sætīlcas* remains a crux because it is unparalleled and the meaning of the second element, if the whole is a compound of *sæ*, is obscure.

It was almost certainly because of these facts that Grein emended to *scealcas*, basing his emendation on the corresponding prose passage<sup>1</sup> and gathering support from the improved alliterative effect brought about by the change.

In spite of these forceful arguments, however, the MS.<sup>2</sup> has *sætīlcas*, not *scealcas*. The particular page is very much obscured, but a strong glass and a good light reveal an unmistakable *t*. This goes far towards confirming the authenticity of *sætīlcas*, and we must remember that Sedgefield<sup>3</sup> found valuable corroboration for this reading from Junius's transcript, made before the fire which caused much of the present obliteration of the manuscript. Yet if we accept *sætīlcas*, we are still left with the problems of meaning and derivation. The line obviously demands the sense of 'man' or 'sailor' for the word, since, as we have seen, the corresponding prose has *mon* and the Latin original,<sup>4</sup> though not conclusive, appears to suggest *hospes* 'visitor'.

In any case some compound of *sæ*, with the meaning of 'sailor' seems likely and this leaves *tilcas* to be explained. No such form is known in Old English.

A plausible suggestion is that we should emend to *sæ-tilhas*, assuming a scribal error. The second element means, in the singular form, 'a cultivator', or 'one who procures with effort' and accordingly *sæ-tilia* might well mean 'merchant, sea-trader', perhaps even 'fisherman'.

<sup>1</sup> The corresponding prose is: 'Ne geherde non mon þa get nanne sciphere ne furpon ymbe nan gefeoht sprecañ'.

<sup>2</sup> Cott. Otho. A. vi, f. 21 a. Dr A. H. Smith kindly informs me that he is able to confirm this reading of the word by examination of the manuscript with ultra-violet rays.

<sup>3</sup> Cf Introduction to *King Alfred's Old English version of Boethius...*, ed. W. J. Sedgefield (1899).

Nondum maris alta secabat  
Nec mercibus undique lectis  
Nova litora uderat hospes  
Tunc classica saeua tacebant.

(Boeth. II, Metra v, ed G. D. Smith, London, 1925, p. 47.)

It will be seen that the O.E. version translates the last line very freely. Perhaps the reference to 'sciphere' was prompted by the thought of contemporary Danish invaders.

The chief obstacles are that in similar compounds such as *eorþ-tilia*, the sense is more literal and that we have a strong plural in the MS., while *tilia* is a weak noun. On the other hand, similar poetic compounds: *sæ-genga*, *sæ-lida* and *scip-flota* are used to designate 'sailor', while in answer to the second objection it may be observed that interchange between strong and weak formation is not unknown in Old English nouns <sup>1</sup>

LONDON.

W. J. REDBOND.

## ETYMOLOGY OF 'CODLIN'.

As long ago as 1888, Bardsley pointed out, in *Notes and Queries*, that the Norfolk name *Quodling*, *Codlin(g)* was identical in origin with the Norfolk apple called a *codlin(g)*, the fifteenth-century form of the name being *Querdling*, for fourteenth-century *Querdelyon*, i.e. *Cœur-de-Lion*, while the apple was also *querdling* in the fifteenth century. Bardsley's suggestion is ignored by the *N.E.D.*, which only mentions a possible connexion with M.E. *quert* (safe and sound). Skeat proposes Irish *cueirt* (apple-tree), and Wyld's *Universal English Dictionary* (1932) does no more than quote Skeat. In a small book published in 1926, I traced the parallel histories of the surname and the word and concluded that the apple was undoubtedly an original *cœur-de-lion*. The naming of fruits from celebrities is a well-known phenomenon. We have our own *shaddock* and *gage*, French *reine-claude*, from the wife of François I, and the *bon chrétien* pear, believed to be so called from St François de Sales. These are, of course, comparatively modern, and it may be asked whether such a practice can be found early enough for *codlin*. The reply is in the affirmative. A year or two ago Professor Raymond Weekes called my attention to a passage in Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Chronique des Ducs de Normandie* (ll. 25280-405) relating an adventure of Richard Sans-Peur. The passage in question will be found in Constans's *Chrestomathie*. Briefly, Richard discovered in the forest a marvellous apple-tree and brought back some of the fruit; but, in spite of his having 'blazed the trail', it could never be found again. However

En plusors lieus par les gardins  
Fist li dux planter des pepins  
Des pomes qu'en out aportees...  
Par ceo qu'eissil trova li dus,  
L'apela chascuns de sa part:  
*Pomier e pomes de Richart.*

<sup>1</sup> H. C. A. Carpenter (*Die Deklination in der nordh. Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Hs.* (Bonn, 1910), §§ 426, 427) records *wtgas*, *stearras*, *hronsparras* and *mercas*.

Thus the *pomme de Richard* is at least three centuries older than the *querdlyng* of the *Promptorium Parvulorum*. Nor does it seem impossible that, for English fruit-growers, Richard Sans-Peur may have been transformed into Richard Cœur-de-Lion. I notice that this etymology of *codlin* is accepted without comment by the new *Webster* (1934)

E. WEEKLEY.

LONDON.

#### THE ANGLO-NORMAN SERMON OF THOMAS OF HALES

Anglo-Norman literature in its later stages is so closely related to Middle English that any evidence for the existence of bilingual (or rather trilingual) authors before the fourteenth century is bound to be of general interest. It is for this reason that Miss Hope Emily Allen suggested to the writer the publication of Thomas of Hales' Anglo-Norman sermon.

As will be seen, the work itself is not of outstanding importance, though it possesses charm and the historical interest which is bound to attach to any piece of pre-Wycliffe evangelicalism, however slight. It appears to be, however, the main part of a sermon in Anglo-Norman, written down very much as it was delivered, and it bears as a title in the MS. the words: 'Secundum fratrem Thomam de hales'. The matter might well have come from the author of the *Love Rune*, and additional evidence for the ascription may perhaps be found in the sermon itself. Mention is made for no particular reason of the Emperor Constantine and his mother St Helen, of whom Thomas of Hales is supposed to have written a Life <sup>1</sup>

The sermon is hardly the work of a pulpit orator, but is a meditation led by the preacher in the style of our present-day Three-Hour Service. An opening section,<sup>2</sup> possibly referring to some particular occasion, has probably been omitted, and the extant beginning is a general statement of the theme illustrated by texts and quotations with a rather clumsy transition to its development. The theme is the importance of the neglected study of the Life of Christ, particularly from the mission point of view, and might seem an odd one for a hagiographer, though not for the poet of the *Love Rune*. Two direct quotations from St Bernard and St Gregory are given, but the whole passage is inspired by their teaching. The development consists of a meditation on the Life of Christ in ten divisions, which are compared to the Ten Talents for reasons which are

<sup>1</sup> See Quéatif and Echard, *Scriptiores Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Paris, 1719-21), I, p. 490.

<sup>2</sup> For the description of the sermon, I have derived much benefit from the perusal of Dr G. R. Owst's *Preaching in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1926), and *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 1933).

not at all clear. Each opens with a prayer in French and closes with one in Latin, in which the congregation may have been expected to join. A Latin summary follows in language recalling that of the Litany. The conclusion, which is of a peculiar grace, is in French. Signs of the times to be noted are: the underlying mariolatry, shown by the emphasis on the part played by the Virgin at the marriage of Cana, and the use of a text (*Luke* xi, 27) in the Latin prayer which only finds a place in Scripture in order that its condemnation may be recorded; the implication that the study of the lives of patron saints was more usual than that of the life of Christ; the mediæval colouring of the description of the mocking of our Lord by the 'pagan knights', the very word *gabbe* being used, and the dramatisation of the Passion in the description of Christ's shame in bearing his Cross in front of his acquaintance. The list of points of interest in this little sermon may be soon exhausted, but the simplicity and sweetness which it shares with the *Merure* of St Edmund make it delightful reading to this day.

The fact that the pulpit did much to keep the English language alive has long been recognised, and many sermons in English have been published; but such Anglo-Norman sermons as have survived have been neglected. Yet, looked at from the point of view of the substance, Anglo-Norman and English religious literature are one. No study of English preaching is really complete which is not based on Anglo-Norman as well as English and Latin sources.<sup>1</sup> The dialect of this particular sermon calls for some remark.

The date of the manuscript, believed to be unique, is of importance. It is St John's College, Oxford, No. 190, a collection of religious works (St Gregory, Bonaventura, etc.) and sermons. All are in Latin save this sermon and the *sermun a dames religioes*, which proved to be St Edmund's *Merure*.<sup>2</sup> The MS. has been supposed to be thirteenth-century, and I am very grateful to Mr N. Denholm Young for advising me on this point. On the first folio the following rubric occurs: 'Liber iste ecclesie beati Petri Westmonasterii ex procuracione fratris Willelmi de Hasele fuit domini Willelmi de Feltham uicarii quondam de [?] aylje. cuius anime propicietur altissimus'. Since William of Haseley, who gave other books to Westminster, was dead by 1283 (*D.N.B.*), it follows that

<sup>1</sup> It is disappointing to find that Dr Owst makes no use of Anglo-Norman sources, contenting himself with casual references, with the inevitable exception of Bozon. In a footnote to p. xviii of *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England* he suggests that Bozon's sermons may have been delivered in English. This does not account for the metrical sermons and the 'Contes' are no evidence either way, for they are not sermons at all, as Dr Owst says himself on p. 302 of *Preaching in Medieval England*.

<sup>2</sup> See *M.L.R.* (October 1928), xxiii, p. 475.

part at any rate of the volume was written before that date. The Anglo-Norman texts indeed occur in the latter part of the book, but nevertheless are written in one of the two hands which run throughout. Even the rubrication is in the same hand, which is probably of about 1270 or earlier. Both the Anglo-Norman texts show the same characteristics, a summary of which follows. The examples are taken from the sermon only.

Most of the usual features of Anglo-Norman are present, with the striking exceptions of the spellings *-aun*, which occurs once, and *-oun*, which occurs twice; *-un* is commoner than *-on*. The spelling of all *e* sounds, *ei* and *oi* are confused, and *e* is usual for *ie* (*cel*=*ciel*, *deu*=*dieu*, *fel*=*fiel*, *ueu*=*vieux*, *cheualers*=*chevaliers*); *e* is found for other vowels (*chechun*, *desciples*). *ui* is usually represented by *u* (*pus*, *condura*), *ll* is commonly *l* (*conseiler*, *merueilhuse*, *recoylh*, *trauaylee*); and *in* is the usual spelling for *gn* (*seynur*, *tesmoynne*, *aynel*, *compayne*), *ngn* also occurs (*deyngnastes*). *n* is used for *m*+consonant (*eint* from *amer*) and *p* is inserted between *m* and *n* (*dampne*, *dampnacium*). Single for double consonants are common (*obeisant*, *acuseurs*, *comandemenz*, *comun*, *nuriseur*). *g* is once used for *j* (*gelusie*). *memorie* and *euangelie* occur, but so do *estoyre*, *gloyre* and *euangelie*. As regards spelling, *y* for *i* and *w* for *u* are found. The Norman ending *-um* for the first pers. plur. pres. indic. is universal. In the last sentence the imperative *sachet* is to be noted, and *esteret*=*étez* occurs twice. Of forms which have left their memorial in English, *angles*, *apostles*, *busoins* and *medler* are all present. In the agreement of articles, adjectives and matters of that sort the MS. is fairly correct.

There are besides a few points of particular interest. Not only is *ei* spelt *e* (*preastes*), but *a* for *ai* (*paens*) and *o* for *oi* (*estoez*) also occur. *eu* gives rise to a variety of spellings, *u*, *o* and *oe* are all found and the English *eo* is used in a rather loose way (*apreochem*, *ceous*=*ceus*, *eoures*=*œuvres*, *saueor*=*sauveur*). Verbs ending in *-oir* supply some interesting forms of the infinitive<sup>1</sup> (*poeir*, *poer* and *poier*=*pouvoir*, *auoer*=*avoir*, *sauoyer*=*savoir*). *esteiez*, *estoeiez*, for the second pers. plur. imperf. indic., though regarded by Dr Tanqueray<sup>2</sup> as fourteenth-century forms, are in general use. As regards spelling, *ch* is twice used for *k* (*chechun*, *desches*).

As the MS. is probably unique, the spelling has been reproduced as it stands and all expansions are in italics. I must here record my gratitude to the Bodleian for housing, and to St John's for lending, the MS. for transcription on this occasion.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. J. Tanqueray, *L'évolution du verbe en Anglo-français* (Paris, 1915), especially p. 848.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 218.

Si condist seint Bernard<sup>1</sup> nul hom ne put nostre duz sire ihesu crist amer : si nel conust ne auer nel put crist si il nel eint ne conustre nel put nus . fors par euangeile ke nus aprent sa uie . e sa doctrine e ses oures . e sa passiun . e sa resurrecciun . e sa assensium e pur co auum nus grant mester qe nus suueaunum sachum la simple estoyre del euangeile mester nus ad qe nus lauun en memorie suuent . Car issi dist duz ihesu<sup>2</sup> Q1 ad mes comandemanz e les gard celi mei eime . e io le ameray e le mustera moi meymes e pus dist il autre foiz<sup>3</sup> Q1 unkes me eyme il gardera mun sermun . e mun pere le amera . e io uendray od mun pere . e meyndray od luy . E unkore dist il qe co est uie pardurable<sup>4</sup> conustre deu son pere et li ihesu crist : E seint Gregorie dist<sup>5</sup> qe autant cum nus amum especiaument nostre tres duz seynur ihesu crist : tant apreocho nus a la cunusance deu le pere tut puyssant E bien est droyt<sup>6</sup> ke nus sachum cunter si mester est a mescreanz la uie . e la ley . celi en ki nus creum . e de autre part si nus penum de sauer la uie le seint ke nus amum especiaument pur la amur duz ihesu crist : mult plus nus deuum nos pener sauer la sue uie demeyne . E si nus sauun conter les fez e les auentures nos<sup>7</sup> ancestres de eue e detreue<sup>8</sup> . e les gestes des paenz dampnez : mult plus deuum sauer conter de nostre sauueur . apres ki nus sumes apelez crestiens e par ki nus sumus fiz e eirs deu meymes e si ceus ki eyment follement tant se delitent penser e parler de ceus ky il eyment . mult plus nus deuum nus deliter en cely ki funtayne de ducor e de amur duz ihesu ke tant nus ayme : ki se uoldra dunc acoynter al duz ihesu primes dort aprendre les choses qe il fist . e dist . e suffri tant cum il estoit en terre e penser les souent pus les uertuz de la seinte alme . e le estat ke il est ore enz el ciel pus la gloire de sa deite . e<sup>9</sup> sun estat apres le iugement quant il auera ses esluz parfitement glorifie . e quant il uoldra de cestes choses penser se mette<sup>10</sup> en repos ke il ne soit a autre chose entendant e die ceste muuaciun al duz ihesu : tut al comencement + Via<sup>11</sup> ueritas et uita<sup>12</sup> veni domine ihesu manifesta mihi te ipsum . Si tost cum il auera sun quer recoyl : e leue primes sun entendement a penser cument deu le pere diuersement e suuent promist as patriarches kil en ueroit son sauoyer qe est apele son fiz . pur prendre humayne nature de lur ligne e come diuersement e apertement il nuncia sa uenue par les prophetes Pensez en apres coment il aparila la pucele de laquele son fiz deuot prendre humanite par le seint esperit : qe ele fust plus pure ke nule autre creature e pleyne de sa grace . Pus pensez coment seint Johan baptiste pur<sup>13</sup> garnir le puple de la uenue son duz ihesu . O ces dis pensers offre of dis saluz ausi cum dis besans car par cestes dis choses pout il recoyllir trestut le euangeile duz ihesu e li duz ihesu dist<sup>14</sup> qe il ressemble vn homme ki bailla dis besanz a ses serianz : e pus lur demanda acontre e dona luer a chechun selonc lur gayn ¶ Co<sup>15</sup> est le premer besant la humilite de incarnaciun duz ihesu Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser coment uus q1 estioez sauoir e poer deu nostre pere . pur nostre feiture reindre e pur duner ensample de humilite . par le seint esperit homme deuenistes e noef moys deynates demurer el uentre uostre duce mere . e crestre en cors e coment uus esteiez conu de seint Johan baptiste qui se ioist as saluz nostre dame uostre mere el uentre sa mere . E coment uostre conception estoit mostree par langle a seint Josep quant il pensa lesser uostre duce mere : qe il out par le seint esperit afiee . Aue dulcissime mi domne<sup>16</sup> mi ihesu Xpe filij dei uiui qui in hunc mundum uenisti beatus<sup>17</sup> uenter qui te portaut et ubera que suxisti<sup>18</sup> amen . Le autre besant la pourete de la nescance duz ihesu . Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser cum uus esteiet ne en la petite cite de bethleem . en mi le comun trespas . e coment uostre duce mere uus enuolupa . uus coucha ele meymes en la creche com cele qe nesteit de uostre nescance travaylee . Aue dulcissime domine mi ihesu Xpe fili dei uiui qui in hunc mundum uenisti<sup>19</sup> beatus uenter qui te portaut et ubera que suxisti.

<sup>1</sup> *Sermones in Cantica*, xxxvii, Migne, 183, p. 971.

<sup>2</sup> *John* xiv, 21-3.

<sup>3</sup> *John* xiv, 23

<sup>4</sup> *John* xvii, 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Moralium*, v, xxxv, Migne, 75, p. 714.

<sup>6</sup> Corrected from *mester*.

<sup>7</sup> Preceded by *des* expunged.

<sup>8</sup> f. 179 b

<sup>9</sup> For *tresauue* = great-grandfather.

<sup>11</sup> *John* xiv, 6.

<sup>10</sup> 'let him put himself.'

<sup>12</sup> *John* xiv, 6.

<sup>13</sup> Something is missing here.

<sup>14</sup> *Matt.* xxv, 14-30.

<sup>15</sup> Each *besant* is signalled by a figure in Arabic numerals in the margin.

<sup>16</sup> f. 179 c.

<sup>17</sup> *Luke* xi, 27.

<sup>18</sup> *Luke* xi, 27

<sup>19</sup> *Sic*.

amen . Le terz besant la beaute del enfance duz ihesu tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser coment les angles nuncierent uostre nessance as pasturs e coment les pasturs uus umdrunt ahurer en la creche e coment uus esteiet *circuncis* e coment uus esteiez demostre par le esteile, e ahore des rois . e coment uus esteiez offert al temple e conu des prophetes e coment uus esteiez set anz exile e les Innocens ocis pur uus . e coment uus esteiez remene de egipte en grant pour e coment uus esteiez troue en temple en mi les eynez e les mestres e coment uus esteiez obeisant a uostre doce mere e a uostre nuriseur seint Josep e uostre deite en duce humilite celastes desches uus fustes de trente ans Aue dulcissime domine mi ihesu Xpe filij dei uiui qui in hunc mundum uenisti *beatus uenter* etc Le quart besant est le amiable iuuenta duz ihesu . Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser coment uus esteiez baptize de seint Johan e demostre de uostre pere par la clarte et par la uoyz celestiele e coment uus esteiez temple del diable apres uostre ieune en desert e serui des angles . e coment seint Johan uus porta tesmoigne souent ki uus esteiez fiz deu e si dument uus apela aynel deu . e coment uus feistes de ewe vin par la uolunte uostre doce mere Aue dulcissime domine mi ihesu Xpe fili dei uiui . qui in hunc mundum uenisti . *beatus uenter* etc Le<sup>1</sup> quint besant est la bunte de la seinte uie duz ihesu Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser de uos ieunes de uos ueyles de uos ureysuns de uos trauailz de uostre grant feruor . de uostre pite de uos pleurs . de uostre boneite de uostre humilite . de uostre grant curteisie de uostre fraunchise come uus esteiez compaynable e commun a uos disciples e pacient a uos auersaies . comme uus esteiez duz e *gracius* as dames ke uus suwerent od uostre beneite mere Com uus esteiez de grant renun en droit tote bonte . Aue dulcissime ihesu Xpe fili dei uiui qui in hunc mundum uenisti *beatus uenter* etc. Le sime besant est la uerite de la doctrine duz ihesu Tresduz ihesu mult fait duz penser de uos duz *sermons* comme uus prechastes simplement e entendablement al poeple . e sagement e parfundement as mestres e as princes . com uus prechastes peniblement e plesablement e ueritablement e purement a la gloire e a la honur deu uostre pere Aue dulcissime domine mi ihesu Xpe fili dei uiui qui in hunc mundum uenisti *beatus uenter* etc. Le setime besant est la merueyluse uertu des eoures duz ihesu . Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser coment uos garistes tote maneres de maladies e en chasates les diables par uostre sole parole e poutes<sup>2</sup> les fameilus e les mors resuscitates . e donastes le poeir de ço meymes fere en uostre non; primes ad doze apostles e pus a seysante deus de disciples . e lur donastes sen e language pur nuncier al poeple uostre plesir e sur tote rien ki uus si legerement pardonastes as pecheurs lur peches e les receustes en uostre seinte compaignie . Aue dulcissime domine mi ihesu Xpe fili dei uiui qui in hunc mundum uenisti *beatus uenter etcetera* . Le utime besant est la memorie de la passion duz ihesu . Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser . ke uus pur humayne ligne reyndre deignastes estre triste e trublee en la cene e pus ke uus auez si docement uos disciples conforte en seruise en sacrement . en sermon en<sup>3</sup> oreisun . uus meymes de angousse suasates la sanglante sour e deynngnastes del angle estre conforte : e pur tuz le uos delurer esteiez uos meymes prise lie . e mene . e auil . deuant Anne . deuant Cayphe . deuant Pilate . deuant herodes . e si diuersement pene . e a la pardefin : si dolorusement dampne . e entre les cheualers paens comme roi receuant gabbe : vostre croiz portant pardeuant tuz uos conuz od dous larrons a Caluayre mene . despoyle . e clofichie<sup>4</sup> e entre deus larrons par escrit merche : e des princes e des mestres e des cheualers e del poeple enas des larrons echarni et gabbe . e de eysil medle od fel . e od murre feustes abusee e ne purquant en mi la peyne preastes pur ceus qe uus crucifirent . e promistes al larron paradis e le disciple ke uus especialment amastes recomandes a uostre duze mere : e quant uus auez emphi quant ke esteit escrit de uus . rendistes uostre esperit a deu uostre pere . e par si hidus signes monstrates uostre deite . sanc espandistes e eue de uostre beneit coste . e de uos disciples esteiez honorablement el sepulture aloes<sup>5</sup> : e des cheualers ieskes al tierz iur garde . en alme descendistes en enfer<sup>6</sup> e en uertu de uostre deite uos esluz delurastes . e les malueys i lessastes qe serrunt al iugement deuant uus resuscitez . e en alme e en cors sanz fin al homeur de uus e aoyement de la ioie de ceus qe uus auez salue : en dampnaciun conferme . Aue dulcissime domine mi ihesu Xpe fili dei

<sup>1</sup> f. 179 d.<sup>3</sup> f. 180 a.<sup>5</sup> 'placed.'<sup>2</sup> 'fed' (from *paître*).<sup>4</sup> 'nailed to the cross.'<sup>6</sup> *enfern* with the *n* expunged.

uui qui in hunc mundum uenisti beatus uenter etc Le noefuime besant est la 101e de la resurreccoun duz ihesu Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser coment uus de mort releuastes e plusurs seynz od uus resuscitastes . par uos angles diuersement uostre resurreccion mostrastes vos gardeins par tere mote . e par venue de angle qe ouri uostre sepulture anguissement espantastes les dames qe uus vindrent enoindre<sup>1</sup> tresducement confortastes cinc fiez cel iur meymes a uos disciples aparustes<sup>2</sup> e a ceous nomeement ke plus aueyent mester de uostre confort Vos playes lur deynastes mostrer e manger deuant eus . el seint esperit lur donastes e entendement de la seinte escripture : qe uostre passion e uostre resurreccion promist as patriarches . e a prophetes e poer lur donastes qe il les almes ke crerent en uus par uostre noun resuscitassent de peche Le vtime iur confermastes la fey seint Thomas par le tast de uos playes a la mer de thabayre si docement dinastes od set de uos disciples . e as vnze apostles autre fiez el mont de thabor uus mustrastes . e pus aparustes a plus de cinc cenx hommes ensemble : e si docement par uus meymes . e par ceus ki uus auiez resuscite ki aparurent a lor acoyntes en la seinte cite : prouastes uostre gloriose resurreccion Aue dulcissime domine mi ihesu Xpe fili dei uui qui in hunc mundum uenisti beatus uenter qui te portaut et uberaque suxisti . amen . Le dime besant est la gloire del assencion duz ihesu . Tresduz ihesu mult fet duz penser coment uus le quarantime iur apres uostre resurreccion pus ke uus auiez mange e beu od uos disciples en ierusalem les menastes en le mont de oliuete . e lur comandastes qe il entendassent la uenu del seint esperit en iherusalem e a quant kil demanderent lur respondistes si docement e pus les besastes e beneistes . e promistes ke uus serriez od eus tot dis . e pus deuant eus of ceus ke uus auiez de enfer deliure . montastes en cel . e uos angles enuoiastes tant tost a eus : pur eus conforter E pus le dime iur lur enuoiastes le seint esperit qe lur dona sen e sauoir et lur aprist toz languages e les fist hardiz prechier uostre deite e lur dona poier de mostrer par miracles qe uus estoiez celi ki deus out promis del commencement del monde a reyndre humeyne lignee<sup>3</sup> E<sup>4</sup> pus conuertistes seint pol . e nus deluerastes del dur seruage de la ueu<sup>4</sup> ley . e pus apres les quatorze anz que esterez al ciel monte . enuoiastes<sup>5</sup> les apostles par tot le mund pur despenser les sacremenz qe uus auiez establi e lur donastes uertu par le seint esperit de ueyntre<sup>6</sup> les ieus e les paiens les princes . e les philophes<sup>7</sup> . e les faus deus e lor prestres par pacience . par simplete . e pus uengeastes uostre mort sor ceus qe uus auient refuse . e amender ne se uoleient e les enchasastes en chetiueite par tot le mond E pus conuertistes lempereor costentin . qe la peys de seinte eglise primes otre<sup>8</sup> . e par sa mere seinte eleyne les dignetez idona . e pus la fey contre les mescreanz si merueusement defendistes e par uostre duce grace tant diuerse maneres de religion a loer uostre duz pere establistes enus a la fin del siecle a nostre foy conuertistes e tant uus estes prest en toz nos busoins a nus conseiller e conforter . ¶ Aue dulcissime<sup>8</sup> domine mi ihesu Xpe fili dei uui qui in hunc mundum uenisti . beatus uenter qui te portaut et ubera que suxisti . Glorificetur in te pater tuus per fidem humillime incarnationis tue . per exemplum pauperime natiuitatis tue . per eleganciam gracissime infancie tue . per profectum dulcissime iuuentutis tue . per innocenciam sanctissime uite<sup>9</sup> tue . per euangelium uerissime doctrine tue . per uirtutem mirifice operacionis tue . per ineffabilem caritatem piissime passionis tue . per immensam potenciam gloriose resurreccionis tue . per eternam gloriam admirabilis assencionis tue . dei uirtus et dei sapiencia . dulcissime ihesu . clarifica<sup>10</sup> nomen<sup>11</sup> tuum<sup>12</sup> . domine salua nos . saluum<sup>13</sup> (fac) populum tuum domine et benedic hereditati tue et rege eos et extolle illos usque in eternum<sup>14</sup> . Ceste auantidite meditacion<sup>15</sup> est ausi comme le beser des pez duz ihesu crist . Mult est grant sen amer especiaument nostre duz seynur ihesu crist . Car nul homme ne puet auer sancte de cors ne de alme . sanz li ki est ueray sauueor ne nule gelusie nel purra fors clore de ses amies . E quant la mort uendra e il couendra rendre resun combien homme eit uesqui combien homme eit iu receu e coment hom leit despendu : quant toz les senz foreins serrunt clos<sup>16</sup> . e serrunt les acuseurs present

<sup>1</sup> f. 180 b.

<sup>4</sup> 'ueuz.'

<sup>7</sup> Sic.

<sup>10</sup> John xii, 28.

<sup>13</sup> Te deum.

<sup>16</sup> Preceded by fors expunged.

<sup>2</sup> aparustes with the 2 expunged.

<sup>5</sup> Corrected from enuoiastes.

<sup>8</sup> dulcissime.

<sup>11</sup> nomem

<sup>14</sup> Te deum.

<sup>3</sup> f. 180 c.

<sup>6</sup> 'vaucre.'

<sup>9</sup> Corrected from uuentutis.

<sup>12</sup> John xii, 28.

<sup>15</sup> f. 180 d.



e nul ami charnel ne purra sucurre : donc serra present li doz ihesu . e receura ses amis a sey meymes e les condura ieskes a la ueuwe de son doz pere e de sa duze mere e de toz ses angles e de toz ses amis la uerrunt e conustringt toz ceus kil amerent en ceste uie en lamor de li O quele demte doit auoer alme pecheiesse qe son creator e son saueor deigne desirer sa priuee amor : e nomeement pus ke ele ad souent follee od son enemī E sachet ki tant est li duz ihesu amorus qe rien en ceste uie ne purrez fere ke tant li plera comme fra qe uus facez ke il seit ame des autres comme de uos meymes.

M. DOMINICA LEGGE.

OXFORD.

#### SIR HENRY LEE'S ENTERTAINMENT OF ELIZABETH IN 1592.

Mr Clifford Leech is right in assuming (*M.L.R.*, xxx, 52) that I had not seen the *Ditchley MS* when I wrote my account of Sir Henry Lee in *The Elizabethan Stage*, but I have been able to study it carefully since it came to the British Museum. I think there can be little doubt that the entertainment of 1592 is by Richard Edes The *Epilogus Caesaris Interfecti* is his, and Mr H. J. M. Milne tells me that the sermon at the end is much in the vein of his *Six Learned and Godly Sermons* (1604) He knew Lee, whose interest he supported in a business affair of 1599 (*Cal. Hatfield MSS.*, ix, 234) I do not agree with Mr Leech in excluding the Page's speech and the *Old Knight's Tale* from the entertainment. It is clear from a speech of Constancy in the *Ladies' Thanksgiving* that the reading of the enchanted tables by the Queen, which broke the spell on the Knight, also broke that on the grove. I hope to give a full text of the entertainment and of the verses elsewhere in the manuscript, as an appendix to a forthcoming book on Sir Henry Lee.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

EYNSHAM.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

The EDITOR,

*The Modern Language Review.*

DEAR SIR,

I regret that there was a serious error in my article on *Milton and the Mosaic Law* published in your journal of January, 1935. On pp. 14 and 16 the following passage is said to be "added in a later hand" on p 310 of the manuscript of *De Doctrina Christiana*:

Itaque in ipsa Mosis persona. .id est, Jesu, ingressus ius datus.

This is a mistake. This passage is in the hand of the amanuensis who wrote the body of the work. Fortunately, the error does not affect my main argument.

ARTHUR SEWELL.

AUCKLAND, N.Z.

## REVIEWS

*A History of Secular Latin Poetry* By F. J. E. RABY. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1934 2 vols. xii+408 pp, 380 pp 35s.

Mr Raby deserves the heartiest congratulations on these large and learned volumes which bring his great task to a successful close. They are in all respects worthy companions of his *History of Christian-Latin Poetry* which has won such widespread and well-merited praise. It is true that it would have been more logical as well as more convenient to the student had the divorce between Secular and Religious poetry never been made. For it could have saved considerable overlapping and would have made it unnecessary to refer back for the important discussion of the rise of rhymed and accentual verse with which the earlier work began. But in view of the exceptional scope of his labours we may accept Mr Raby's apology (I, p. vi) with no more than a passing murmur.

In his opening chapter he has wisely insisted on the continuity of Latin poetry. This chapter was probably the most difficult of all to write; it is perhaps too closely packed and may be criticised as containing matter which is scarcely relevant to the main theme. The history of Greek and Roman rhetoric is rightly stressed here as being fundamental to the whole development of later Latin verse and, it may be added, to much of the Latin prose of the Middle Ages. But a more detailed discussion of the methods of rhetorical education would have been valuable; and room could have been found for such a discussion by sacrificing less important matter.

In the rest of his work Mr Raby follows the plan so successfully pursued in his previous work, he traces the literary currents of succeeding centuries, the decline and the recovery of scholarship and culture, the influence of rhetorical tradition, the rise of new themes and forms of poetry, with lucidity and skill, and makes the past live again by vivid sketches of his authors and their times. If we meet many bad poets we also fall in with a number of agreeable and interesting persons. Like its predecessor this book is not merely a history, but an anthology, so vast that it is only possible to deal with it superficially and in very general terms. Of the wilderness of hexameters and elegiacs there is little good to be said, and we are perhaps given too many examples of their mediocrity. They sometimes reveal character and often provide valuable evidence for the literary history of their day. Bad poetry as they mostly are, their authors were at least handing on the torch of culture, however dimly it flickered in their hands. And there are a few interesting forms, e.g. the doggerel Beast-Epic (circ. 950) known as the *Ecbasis captivi* (I, 269), the elegiac comedy based on Plautus (twelfth century) and the analogous *contes* of William of Blois and others (see II, 54 sqq.), which are of real historical interest. But as far as poetry is concerned, two poems stand out supreme, the *Waltharius* of Ekkehart (tenth century, see I, 262), of which all too little is cited, and the *De Contemptu Mundi*

of Bernard of Cluny (twelfth century). The *Waltharius*, despite its wholesale pilferings and a grotesqueness that sometimes borders on absurdity, is conceived in the true epic spirit and tells its wild tale with infinite vigour, to read it is an unforgettable experience. The *De Contemptu Mundi* (II, 49), that amazing outpouring of passionate piety, coupled with a satirical invective that makes Juvenal comparatively wan, is no less remarkable as a metrical *tour de force*, with its rhymed hexameter couplets, defying all classical laws and marvellously adorned with internal rhymes.

Far more important however for the history of European literature is the rhymed accentual verse, the germs of which were already latent in the early quantitative verse of Rome; there is no need to go further. Even in Classical quantitative verse, the stress-accent was felt and added to the beauty and suppleness of the verse. The accentual and rhymed poems of the Middle Ages had become familiar in the Hymns of the Church before they had become current coin in secular verse. And in view of the comparatively late development of rhymed verse in the languages of Western Europe, we may reasonably believe that it is primarily to the Hymn that rhyme in the vernacular owes its birth. Such seems to be the view held in substance by Mr Raby, though it deserves somewhat more detailed development. As to the relation between the Latin and the Vernacular lyric he is wisely cautious; though he ventures the suggestion that 'lyrical themes and lyrical impulse' were given to the Latin lyric by the Vernacular. He is equally cautious concerning the vexed problem of the rise of the pastourelle. Neither of these problems is capable of definite solution. But it is hard to believe that the pastourelle owes nothing to the Eclogues of Virgil and the pastoral element which is so clearly visible in the Classical writers of elegy and not a few of their successors.<sup>1</sup>

While the rhymed lyric seems to make its first appearance in the charming *Ut quid iubes, pusiole*, of Gottschalk toward the middle of the ninth century (see I, 226-7), and we are shown further examples from Italy a few generations later (I, 288-90), it is with the revival of letters and learning in the twelfth century that the technique reaches its perfection and the form its vogue. Though its blossoming was brief and faded away with the passing of the next century, it provides a feast of colour and fragrance (sometimes pungent) during its comparatively brief life. And it is in the last 160 pages of his second volume that Mr Raby provides the lover of poetry with his real banquet. No more than the briefest indication of the fare can be given here. From Hugh Primas of Orleans (overrated perhaps) he proceeds to the Archpoet, whose *Aestrians intrinsecus* is not only the best known but both in point of form and matter the most deservedly famous of the poems of the period; a fragmentary example of the so-called Goliardic metre occurs, it may be noticed, in the absurd sixth-century Spaniard who called himself Virgilius Maro (I, 155). From the Archpoet we are led on to Walter of Châtillon, who provides the first pastourelles,—the dactylic *Apocalypse* of Goliath,

<sup>1</sup> See *Christian-Lahn Poetry*, ch. I, and vol. II, pp. 322 sqq. of the present work.

perhaps the work of an Englishman,—Philippe de Grève, the sweetest singer of them all with a surpassing ear for vowel-music,—the Love poems of the Ripoli MS.,—the amazing anthology of the MS *Carmina Burana*, and many others. The long array of delightful poems on the joys and sorrows of love, intermingled with satire, sometimes cynical, sometimes serious, closes with the examples of the 'Poetical Debate'. We hear Spring and Summer, Wine and Water contending together, or listen to Phyllis and Flora discussing at length whether the Knight or the Clerk makes the best lover, and—last but not least—are presented with a Bishop's dream, in which he sees a Soul sitting beside the coffin of a Body that had been its home, Body and Soul denounce each other savagely in a grim uncanny poem, whose full publication will be eagerly awaited (II, 300).

The study of this fascinating book suggests many pleasing speculations. When is a poem accentual and when quantitative? A very difficult problem! Is *O Roma nobilis orbis et domina* purely dactylic in origin or derived from the Asclepiad pronounced accentually?—for this done, it is quite easy to sing *Mæcenas atavis edite regibus* to the ancient tune of *O quanta qualia sunt ista Sabbata*! How far can the provenance of a poem be deduced from its accentuation?—But these be vain delights; and Mr Raby has wisely avoided chasing wild geese, and has produced a book of the greatest interest and importance to students of modern and Classical literature. If some of the authors with whom he deals are dull, he never is, and—a high virtue this—he rarely sends the seeker empty away.

H. E. BUTLER.

LONDON.

*Heldenstolz und Wurde im Angelsächsischen.* Von LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.  
(*Abhandl. d. Sachs. Akademie d. Wissensch., Phil.-hist. Kl., XLII, 5.*)  
Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1933. iv+46 pp. M. 3

In this interesting if somewhat discursive article, Professor Schücking takes up the position that self-praise is not simply to be regarded as a primitive artistic means of conveying information about the hero, but that the Germanic poet's wish is to show his hero with complete knowledge of his own value. So the thesis adopted is that self-assurance is only one function of the rôle played by pride and dignity in the ideal of personality in the A.S. epic. Thence Schücking deals with the words most commonly used in introducing speeches of self-praise—*bēot* and *gylp*—words whose difference in meaning is obscured in A.S. *Bēot* he takes as meaning 'vow of performance', and considers it is only taken when the speaker has proved to himself that he can perform the task he has set himself; therefore the *bēot* is an important criterion of character. Further, *bēot* has not in A.S. the derogatory meaning found in, for example, the *Heliland* and the *Ludwigshed*. While *bēot* is intended for the benefit of friends and companions, *gylp*—threats and scorn of the enemy—is intended for the opponents of the speaker, as in the solitary example in A.S., the conflict of words between Beowulf and Unferð.

Schücking then proceeds to an analysis of heroic pride—that feeling of self respect and of superiority, founded on consciousness of noble birth. After dealing with various aspects of pride, such as the pride of the king or leader, he points out how completely the ideas of pride and of fame contrast with the Christian teaching of humility. This leads to a discussion of the character of Hroðgar, the Augustinian king set in a background of pre-Christian ideals, and also to treat of the meanings of *wlancu* and *wlencu*, which are only in *Beowulf* used without a derogatory meaning.

An 'Anhang' contains an analysis of the chief characters in *Beowulf*—Beowulf himself, Hroðgar, and Wealhpeow—under three heads: the delayed naming of the characters, which is merely conventional; 'Reflexcharakteristik'—the putting of praise into the mouth of a disinterested person—which is also common in epic poetry, and characterisation through the speeches of the people themselves.

On the whole, Professor Schucking succeeds in making his points, though he has a tendency to turn aside to start as interesting if smaller game. Perhaps, though, his description of *Beowulf* as a transitional epic, with the hero emerging from the position of a Hercules to that of a courtier, might have curious results if pushed to its logical conclusions. How, for example, are we to reconcile these statements with the normally accepted dating of the poem, or the treatment of *gylp* with the figure of Hroðgar? Almost it might revive the old vexed questions about the composite nature of *Beowulf*, and the Christian element in that poem.

Some smaller points might also be noted. Is it the case that (p. 11) Ælfwine seeks to take over the command at Maldon on the death of Byrhtnoð, basing his claim on his noble family, and reminding the companions of his father's name and rank? Cf. Mald. 220 ff. Does *wlencu* (*Beo.* 1206) really mean 'self-appointed task, praiseworthy spirit of adventure'? (p. 19 n. 2). Does *sieghreþing* (*Beo.* 94) mean 'famed in victory' (siegeberuhmte) (p. 15), and is the *hleator* of *Beo.* 611 that of exultation (p. 11) rather than of relief? It is not perhaps so striking as Professor Schucking supposes that fame does not play so important a part in the second part of *Beowulf* as in the first; after all, Beowulf had achieved fame by then! And finally, there are a number of curious mistakes as to lines in the text—*Beo.* 277 (p. 1) for 278, *Beo.* 1883 (p. 10) for 1882, *Beo.* 2512 (p. 13) for 2513, and *Beo.* 1012 (p. 21 n. 2) for 1011. I cannot suggest a reason for these curious slips; my corrections are based on the Heyne-Schücking and Klaeber editions.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

EDINBURGH.

*The Drama of the Mediæval Church.* By KARL YOUNG. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1933. Vol. I, pp. xx+708; Vol. II, pp. 611. 63s.

It is twenty-five years since Karl Young published his *Contributions to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen*. He has been busy in other fields since then, but his eighteen subsequent publications on Mediæval Latin Drama have proved the intimacy of his acquaintance with the entire *corpus* of the pre-vernacular religious plays of the Middle Ages.

It is this *corpus* of Latin texts, supported by a great wealth of commentary, explanatory, bibliographical and critical, that is presented to us in the two handsome volumes under our notice. As long ago as 1903 Sir E. K. Chambers had devoted the first two chapters of the second volume of his *Mediaeval Stage* to the Latin drama of the mediæval Church. He described it as 'a most singular new birth'; and he added that it is not often that the historian is privileged 'to isolate a definite literary form throughout the whole course of its development, and to trace its rudimentary beginnings, as may be done here beyond the very borders of articulate speech'. Young has expanded the two chapters of Chambers into two volumes. He does not deal with the passage of this drama into the vernacular, with its divorce, that is, from its place of origin within the Latin framework of the Mass or the Canonical Office. For the history of this transition we must turn to Chambers' chapter on the 'Secularisation of the Plays'. Yet it is precisely because Young has confined himself to the pre-vernacular drama of western Christendom that his work has fundamental importance. We now know how very far religious drama had developed before it ceased to be liturgical. We know how widely it was distributed in virtually identical forms; Young places a Dublin Easter play side by side with a parallel example from Moosburg. We can form an estimate of the extent to which the populace participated. Above all we know that from first to last the drama was sung and not declaimed.

There is nothing, I believe, that the inquisitive reader may need to know in order to comprehend the method and setting of these plays that Young does not put us on the way to realising. He devotes an important section of his first volume to an analytical study of the form of the Mass itself and of the Canonical Office, so that the reader may know where and how dramatic and choral elaborations were introduced. He shows from the *Peregrinatio Erikeræ* that dramatic ceremonial was already attracting pilgrims to the Holy Places in Palestine in the fourth century. He points to other dramatic tendencies of Christian worship. There was the representation of the events annually observed in the Calendar of the Church's year from Advent and Christmas to Easter and Ascension. The solemn ceremonies of Holy Week culminating in the festival of Easter began with the processions of Palm Sunday, and included the rites of Maundy Thursday, the burying of the Host and Crucifix on Good Friday, and the *ordo* of the Harrowing of Hell on Easter Eve. The Christmas season on the other hand was one of revelry as well as devotion. The junior clergy kept the Feast of Fools and the choristers provided a Boy Bishop. In all this there was much that was dramatic that nevertheless could not be called a drama or play. Indeed the Sacrament of the Mass is itself dramatic; and it was within the Liturgy in its stricter sense that Christian religious drama had its simple beginnings. It originated in music and may be traced back to the wordless *sequences* or choral elaborations of the final vowel of the 'Alleluia' of the Mass. These long musical phrases came to be supplied with words appropriate to particular Feasts; and we are told by a monk of St Gall, Notker (c. 875),

how he heard of the innovation and became a composer of the new *proses* or *sequences*. His words helped him and the singers to memorise the music. At first these compositions were in prose—a syllable to each note, in time they became hymns, e.g. *Victimæ Paschali, Dies Iæ, Veni Sancte Spiritus*. Similar elaborations (*tropes*) took the form sometimes of dialogue, question and answer being sung antiphonally. Such is the simple tenth-century dialogue—*Quem quæritis*—between the Angels and the three Marys sung at St Gall before the Introit of the Easter Mass. Many versions of this Easter trope have survived with their music in early service or choir books, in some of which are directions showing how it was acted. Further dramatic development of the *Quem quæritis* trope would have disturbed the essential dignity of the Mass. It was transferred therefore to the Matins of Easter morning, where it preceded the *Te Deum*. Here it was free to expand into a complete Easter play, including (a) the special Easter hymn, *Victimæ Paschali*, sung by the Marys, (b) the race of Peter and John to the Sepulchre, (c) the meeting of Christ and Mary Magdalen, (d) the merchant who sells spices to the women, (e) Roman soldiers guarding the tomb, while (f) later plays include the Journey to Emmaus. Add to these, the further development of a full Passion Play, as recorded with music in the *Carmina Burana*, and we have in bare outline the subject matter of the first volume. But it is in the plenitude of original and picturesque detail that the fascination of Young's work rests, e.g. the striking picture of the *palmesel* from Steinen and the description of the ceremonial of Palm Sunday at Essen; the hitherto unpublished record of the revels of Innocents' Day at Padua (thirteenth century); the illustrations of the Easter sepulchres and the ordering of the *Depositio* and *Elevatio Crucis*; the various instances of the admission, participation, or exclusion of the populace; the reforms at Barking in Chaucer's day by the Abbess, Katherine of Sutton; the association of early sequences and tropes with the intellectual revival fostered by Charlemagne; the rapid growth of realism in impersonation, and the numerous examples of explicit 'stage directions' set out in the various *ordines*, as well as the significant instructions to the actors (*celeri gressu, querula voce, Petro claudicante*, etc.).

Volume II has even more variety of matter than the first volume. It includes the Christmas plays and 'Other plays based on the Bible and on legend'. As the centre of action of the Easter plays was the Sepulchre, so that of the Nativity play was the Manger (*præsepe*). The visit of the Shepherds to the Manger corresponded to the visit of the Marys to the Sepulchre; and the Easter question was changed to *Quem quæritis in præsepe, pastores?*—the question being put by two midwives ('duo canonici cum duobus pluvialibus [rain-capes] qui vocantur obstetrices'). The dramatic development of the Christmas plays followed—as with the Easter plays—only after the transference of the trope to Matins. More impressive dramatically than the Shepherd plays are the Epiphany plays of the *Visit of the Magi*. The introduction of Herod, 'exceeding wroth', frees the way for broad comedy, for the Christmas season seems to have justified the admission of boisterousness even into the Office of

Matins. Inevitably associated with Herod are the *Flight into Egypt*, and the *Slaughter of the Innocents* ('Intrant cantantes pueri'). To Christmas belongs also the *Play of the Prophets* who foretold Christ's coming. All these themes—Shepherds, Magi, Innocents and Prophets—are assembled in a notable play in the *Carmina Burana* from Benediktbeuern.

Passing to other subjects, biblical or legendary, two plays of the *Raising of Lazarus* deserve attention, one from Fleury, where there is a famous Easter Sepulchre, the other by Hilarius, the disciple of Abelard. To Fleury belongs also the play of the *Conversion of St Paul*, which like most of the Latin plays survives with its music. The story lends itself naturally to dramatic treatment. Interesting, because Young tells the whole story of how Philippe de Mezières (1326–1405) brought it from the East, is the apocryphal play on the *Presentation of the Blessed Virgin in the Temple*. De Mezières' own copy of the play with minute directions for staging, dress and production are here printed. From the Old Testament, besides plays on *Jacob and Esau* and on *Joseph and his Brethren*, we have two plays of much interest on *Daniel*, one by Hilarius, the other by students of Beauvais. These turn Young's attention to the *scolares vagantes*, whose patron was St Nicholas; and his miracles provided them with matter for plays. The most popular of these presented the story of the three wandering scholars who were murdered by their host and restored to life by their saint.

I have said enough to show how ample is the feast of good reading that Young has set before us, and it may seem churlish if I close my review on a note of regret. Nevertheless I wish that he had set out one or two of the best plays with their music transcribed into an intelligible modern notation. I fear that the ordinary reader will fail to realise that these plays originated in the choir and developed there; they were choral to the end, that is so long as they remained liturgical. I know that Professor Young says in his Introduction that an 'aspect of these plays that has not been explored is their melodies'. I know also that he is as good a musician as he is liturgiologist—and that is high appreciation. May he not be prevailed upon to supplement his *magnum opus* by publishing a select body of these primitive oratorios, set as the sequences *Lauda Sion* or *Victimæ Paschali* are set out in the English Hymnal, in a modern notation?

A. W. REED.

LONDON.

*The Knowledge of Greek in England in the Middle Ages.* By GEORGE R. STEPHENS. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1933. 167 pp. \$1 75.

*Der Englische Frühhumanismus. Ein Beitrag zur englischen Literaturgeschichte des 15. Jahrhunderts.* Von WALTER F. SCHIRMER. Leipzig: B. Taubnitz. 1931. 184 pp. 10 M. 80.

These two dissertations are, in a sense, complementary, the first serving as a useful introduction, from one special aspect, to the wider theme of early English humanism. Incidental reference to knowledge or ignorance



of Greek during the Middle Ages is common property to all the standard histories of literature and scholarship, but the subject is of sufficient interest and the evidence of sufficient bulk to provide scope for separate treatment. By figuring out the broken track of Greek scholarship in England from the seventh to the fifteenth century Mr Stephens enables us to approach the greater figures like Grosseteste and Bacon with a proper perspective and to gauge more accurately the contribution of Grocyn, Linacre and their immediate predecessors. It is here that he touches on the same ground as Herr Schirmer, who is primarily concerned with the development of humane studies as a whole in England during the later Middle Ages and with the several stages and symptoms of that development through book-collecting, the patronage of letters and the achievements of itinerant English scholars in Italy. The close proximity of the two writers at this point of their investigation is indicated by their use of manuscript material; Herr Schirmer summarises the contents of John Free's unprinted *Cosmographia* and reproduces for the first time extracts from the correspondence of Free's friend Tiptoft, Mr Stephens transcribes the whole of Free's letters from MS. Bodley 587. Each thesis is a useful and well-documented contribution to the history of letters and culture in mediæval England, a subject upon which much still remains to be written; of the two, Herr Schirmer's is the more important by reason of its wider range and as the first systematic study of a phase in the English Renaissance which no student of literary history can afford to neglect.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

*The English Folk-Play.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1933. vi+248 pp. 10s.

Since Sir Edmund Chambers first gave an account of the Mummers' Play in *The Mediæval Stage* much new material has been collected, and to the great benefit of scholarship he has considered it 'worth while to go over the ground again, and to bring together the threads of the old and the new evidence with regard to this singular and long enduring seasonal ceremony'. Sir Edmund has a gift for understatement where his own work is concerned. In *The English Folk-Play* he makes fresh and varied information accessible to us, and, having gathered together all the available material, considers it as a whole, in the light of his encyclopædic knowledge of folk-lore and mediæval drama. This is likely to prove the finally authoritative work on the subject.

The arrangement of the book is a little confusing at times, but this is no doubt due to the nature of the subject-matter. Having constructed a 'normalized text', Sir Edmund proceeds to analyse it into component parts, examining each character and episode with unprecedented thoroughness and illustrating his points with entertaining quotations from the actual texts. His identification—after due suspense—of the missing Dragon with the mysterious Beau Slasher I found particularly pleasing. Especially interesting, also, is the Ampleforth Plough Play,

where traditional elements are combined with ill-remembered and ill-assorted scraps from Congreve's *All for Love*; and the Weston-sub-Edge Play, where the 'Cure' episode is expanded by would-be comic but actually very stupid dialogue and patter 'All this', remarks Sir Edmund, who is no sentimentalist in these matters, 'comes straight from the village. It is the folk at its worst.' This book, indeed, offers little encouragement to those who like to find a communal or folk origin for art and literature. The corruptions undergone by the Mummers' Play ('activity of youth, activity of age', for instance, appearing in one version as 'Act Timothy of youth, act Timothy of age') bear melancholy witness to the low level of culture prevalent in English villages during the nineteenth century, the result of 'enclosures and Speenhamland dole'. Students of social history and culture, as well as folk-lorists, should find much to interest them in *The English Folk-Play*.

Sir Edmund Chambers' clear presentment of the history of the Mummers' Play is particularly welcome. His conclusions are stated with a reassuring caution and freedom from bias. The existing examples probably go back to a single archetype, which cannot have been composed before the sixteenth century, although the fundamental elements of the play may well be of a more remote antiquity. The search for mediæval parallels proved disappointing, but strikingly similar ceremonies from Western Europe and from the Balkans suggest the existence of an original European *ludus*, performed in animal disguise, and dealing with a mock death and revival. The suggested explanation of the significance of this *ludus* carries us into territory familiar to readers of *The Golden Bough*. The folk-play was originally a fertility rite in which 'the fertilization spirit in animal form' was sacrificed, and the priest-king or his substitute was put to death. In view of the evidence concerning the dying and rising god, collected by Dr Frazer, it is not quite clear why Sir Edmund should be so puzzled by the linking of death and revival in the folk-play that he suggests on p. 221 two possible explanations for which 'there is not much evidence beyond that of a natural logic'. Surely even the oldest parallels to our folk-plays are not so old that the influence upon them of an anthropomorphic as well as of a 'phytomorphic or theriomorphic conception of divinity' can only be admitted as a bare possibility (op. p. 222). For the singular 'Man in Woman's Clothes', and for the 'Quête', Sir Edmund gives the same explanation as he gave in *The Mediæval Stage*. The presence of the 'Man-Woman' probably recalls an original predominance of the female sex in agriculture. The 'Quête' is 'a perambulation taking the beneficent influence from house to house'. This may well be so, but, in this connexion, one would have welcomed a more detailed enquiry into why the performers of the play were called 'Mummers', a term which may have once had a more precise meaning than Sir Edmund is inclined to admit. Considerations of space forbid any detailed discussion of the subject here, but I have suggested elsewhere that there is some evidence for connecting the Momerie or Mummung with Mormo (an ogress of Greek folk-lore), who seems to have been connected with some kind of masquerade, possibly a muming of the Wild Hunt. The Momerie

may have travelled westwards via Venice and the Tyrol, and the Mummers may have personated the spirits or ghosts who were popularly supposed to partake of the 'Tables of Fortune' set out by the superstitious at Christmas time. I am not, of course, suggesting that the Momerie is to be equated with the Mummings' Play, but only that it might be worth consideration in connexion with the Quête. After all the Quête is a collection, and the Mummers seem distinctly more anxious to receive than to give.

The chief impression which remains after reading *The English Folk-Play* is astonishment at the wide ramifications and rich human interest of a subject which one had been inclined to regard as narrow and even a little dry. But Sir Edmund Chambers always makes exact scholarship a means of bringing to life any subject to which he turns his attention.

ENID WELSFORD.

CAMBRIDGE.

*Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* By DOUGLAS BUSH. University of Minnesota Press; London: H. Milford. 1932. 360 pp. \$4.

Mythology can, and does, in these days lead poets and critics into strange regions—the descent into the Avernus of the Unconscious is only too easy. The Preface to this book, however, is enough to reassure the hard-headed but slightly nervous reader; as soon as he has followed up the heartening names (culminating in that of Professor Livingstone Lowes) in whose tradition Professor Bush aligns himself, and has reached the sentence 'Finally, my wife did not compile the index', he knows he is safe and settles down to enjoy himself.

As the broad unity of any period especially stimulating to the researcher becomes broken up by highly specialised studies of very limited fields, the wood vanishes in the trees. Yet someone must continue to see the wood if proportion is to be kept. Professor Bush has worked long at the detailed elucidation of mythological topics in Renaissance poetry; it may be reckoned to him as an inspiration to have seen that in mythology he had a means of refocusing a scattered and multifarious field where perspective was in danger of being lost. One of the outstanding merits of the book is its organisation of the sequence and development of Elizabethan non-dramatic poetry as a whole, from the mediæval heritage to the evaporation of myth in parody.

Not all the topics surveyed repay Professor Bush equally well. The minor mythological writers (ch. ix) and even Drayton and the Fletchers (ch. viii) chronicle a small nectar from which nothing very rich can be distilled. On the other hand I unhesitatingly pick out the chapter on Marlowe (vi) as one of the ripest and most balanced criticisms of that dangerously attractive figure that have appeared in recent years—although, indeed, the estimate of Marlowe is not complete until the whole book has been read, for to the *Hero and Leander* Professor Bush returns continually for a standard of comparison. The chapters on the other major poets, Spenser (v), Shakespeare (vii) and Milton (xiv), are also

notable for their definiteness and freshness of approach. The re-examination by scholarship and exact, discriminating reading of the somewhat frozen theme 'Milton, a son of the Renaissance' was exceedingly well worth doing. In the presence of the metaphysicals and their eulogists Professor Bush can do something more than keep his head. There is plenty of scope here for divergence of personal opinion, but the brief study of Chapman (ch. x) will be relished by all those who, on this subject, welcome a touch of cold steel.

In range and valiancy of diction Americans are the Elizabethans of the modern world. Professor Bush never flags. The book is written in a luminous and generous diction, studded with rich or happy phrases, metaphors and analogies, original and adapted. In the Middle Ages, when the 'octopus of allegory [lay] floating many a rood', 'up and down the ladder joining these three planes [material, moral and spiritual] the allegorists moved like the angels in Jacob's dream'. Chaucer, 'though learned was not a mousing scholar'. In Shakespeare's poems 'action bears to Rhetoric much the same proportion as bread to sack in Falstaff's bill'. This is the humanity of scholarship. If to some inhabitants of a circumscribed and weary island the generosity sometimes appears spendthrift, there remains the wit. The book is salted with delightful astringencies. Of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece* we are told: 'everything that can be said about these poems has been said... with that fearless disregard of repetition that characterises Shakespearean scholarship'. The stiletto is sometimes needle-pointed: 'In modern times the tendency has been, especially among persons with a tincture of Greek and anthropology, to depreciate and neglect the legacy of Rome'.

In a work so amply planned and firmly handled it would be ungracious to insist on a few queries and reservations provoked in the reading. The book is excellently printed and produced and is provided with a liberal *apparatus criticus* in the form of footnotes (a mine of supplementary information), Appendix, Bibliography and Index.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

*Peter Sterry, Platonist and Puritan, 1613-1672: A Biographical and Critical Study with passages selected from his Writings.* By VIVIAN DE SOLA PINTO. Cambridge: University Press. 1934. xiii+242 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

'It is a great inconvenience to men of extraordinary discoveries and sublimity, that they must speak to very few.' Thus, only three years after his death, wrote Richard Baxter of Peter Sterry, Puritan divine and chaplain to Oliver Cromwell. The few to whom he then spoke, despite his important position, soon thinned to none, or almost none. A scholarly fastidiousness, a quiet spirit of mysticism, and an indifference to fame restrained him from publicity. At his death eight sermons represented the sum of all that he had seen fit to print. But he left behind him unpublished manuscripts. An unfinished *Discourse of the Freedom of the Will*, which Sterry was preparing for publication at the last, was brought

out by an unknown editor in 1675. Eight years later a selection from Sterry's papers was edited, apparently by Jeremiah White, another of Cromwell's chaplains, under the splendid title of *The Rise, Race and Royalty of the Kingdom of God in the Soul of Man*, and in 1710 Joshua Sprigg printed another selection as *The Appearance of God to Man In the Gospel*. After this, save for reprints of two or three pieces in volumes containing work by others, editors abandoned Sterry.

Manuscript remains of Peter Sterry, contained in seven volumes, have, however, despite the obscurity that befell him, been preserved by descendants of the family. These are partly in his own hand. They were examined by Dr Grosart, who, had he lived, would probably have anticipated Professor Pinto's recall of Sterry from an almost complete oblivion. The delay is not to be regretted, for the latter, with careful scholarship and a balanced enthusiasm, which command attention if not always acquiescence, has restored a forgotten Puritan divine to a place in the history of mystical theology and of English prose writing.

Sterry was something of a trial and enigma to colleagues and contemporaries. The harshness of Independent doctrine was tempered in him by vast reading and a sympathetic acquaintance with Platonism and the mystics of sects and creeds differing widely from the dominant dogmatisms of Protectorate England. Little wonder that he was suspect of heresy, that his spirit of tolerance was esteemed a reproach.

At Cambridge Sterry came under the influence of Benjamin Whichcote, a contact which determined his thought in courses parallel to the philosophy of the Cambridge Platonists. It is curious that a man so fitted by temper to academic seclusion and the stillness of libraries should, after election to a fellowship at Emmanuel College, have chosen to sever his connexion with the university. If his conscience dictated independence it may be questioned whether there was not a loss to be counted. The mystery of godliness was distracted by religious and political controversy; the reconciliations were not easy to reach; there is a shapelessness in Sterry's expression and thought, which, as it made him unintelligible to his contemporaries, disconcerts the modern reader.

The idea implicit in the Cambridge Platonists, the Divine illumination of human reason, governed Sterry's thinking, but he failed to read clearly the signs of the times. Cudworth and More recognised the danger to revealed religion of the philosophy of Hobbes, and set themselves to combat it. Like them a latitudinarian, Sterry, in his attempt to reconcile opposing doctrines, had little influence on practical religion. And, on the other side, it would be difficult to claim for him that, with them, he offers any enduring contribution to the philosophy of religion. He displays, as Professor Pinto shows, 'interesting affinities' with varying systems of thought and philosophy, but this hardly entitles him to consideration as 'a very profound thinker'. And many, probably, will feel that a like difficulty attaches to an unreserved appreciation of his prose, which Professor Pinto would range with the best in that great age. Despite imaginative quality and poetic instinct it often lacks rhythm and rounded completeness.

Nevertheless Professor Pinto's labour of love is well justified. His presentation of Sterry could scarcely have been better done. He discusses the man and his writings delightfully and persuasively in the earlier half of this volume, devoting the latter half to selections designed to illustrate both Sterry's doctrine and his mastery of prose.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

ASPENDEN, HERTFORDSHIRE.

*Milton's Blindness.* By ELEANOR GERTRUDE BROWN. New York: Columbia University Press; London. Oxford University Press. 1934. viii + 167 pp. 12s. 6d. net.

This treatise on Milton's blindness, contrary to rule, is neither dull nor preposterous, and it deals definitively, one hopes, with the tiresome medical aspects. Although not herself a physician, Miss Brown has canvassed medical opinion on every detail of the case and carried the diagnosis as far as seems prudent. But the interest and value of her book does not end there. Being herself blind she has examined the effects of blindness in Milton's life and writings with the advantage, as one may say, of a similar experience. It becomes clear how much we needed the corrective guidance of one who knows what blindness means.

Miss Brown shows that in view of the ignorance of ophthalmology in the seventeenth century we can expect no reliable or adequate evidence on the nature and cause of Milton's blindness. But there is no evidence at all to support Mutschmann's theory of albinism or Saurat's theory of congenital syphilis; what evidence there is contradicts them, and they contradict themselves. These are politely dubbed the *fantastic views*. The two most probable explanations are (1) glaucoma, (2) myopia with detachment of the retina. Myopia tends to run in families; the weak eyes of Milton's mother, daughter and granddaughter, and the fact that his father read without spectacles at the age of 84, all point to congenital myopia. Medical authority is quoted for the further theory of a streptococcal infection that could have produced both the blindness and the gout of which Milton ultimately died. Milton's own suggestion that hard study from childhood days was the primary cause of his blindness cannot be accepted as a medical explanation, though this may well have aggravated the original trouble. A point worth noting is that, according to the contemporary evidence so fully set out by Miss Brown, the left eye began to fail about 1640, which alone would explain why Milton did not enter the Parliamentary army.

The rest of the book is concerned with the effects of blindness in Milton's life and writings. What Miss Brown mainly does is to repeat, emphasise, illustrate and endorse Milton's own clear accounts of his mental history after blindness overtook him; and this is well, since so many refuse to believe anything Milton says, more especially about himself, paradoxically thinking him both a great poet and a great liar. She deals first with the three sonnets on his blindness, and her discussion of the earliest of these, 'When I consider how my light is spent', reveals the first stages in the story. Attending simply to Milton's own words, she points out that

the poem is a complete expression of the tragedy of blindness, written at a time when Milton had overcome the first bitterness of defeat and accepted his fate, but before he had adapted himself to the new conditions of life imposed on him or realised that he was far from disabled. The blinded do not acquiesce without a struggle, but the standing and waiting that blindness exacts brings patience, Milton's poem expresses both the struggle and the ultimate submission to God's will—that calm and proud submission described by Mr Tillyard as the cringing of a beaten dog. A man of Milton's temper, however, will not long remain in this passive mood of acquiescence: 'to the intelligent blind person his handicap is constantly an experiment'. He progresses step by step, making new discoveries as to what it is possible for him to accomplish'. Milton had triumphantly learned this final lesson when he realised that he could yet write the poem after ages should not willingly let die.

It is not clear why Miss Brown should wish to allow Milton so much time for these successive stages in his mental history, dating the first sonnet on his blindness as late as 1655 and the commencement of *Paradise Lost* after the death of his second wife in 1657. The eight psalms translated in the summer of 1653, as she agrees, show Milton in the act of striving for mental safety and peace; while the *Second Defence*, published in 1654, shows him once more master of his fate:

My blindness, with which you reproach me, deprives things of their colour and surface, but it does not take away the mind's contemplation of whatever is real and permanent in them. . . . There is a way through weakness to strength. May I be of the weakest, provided only in my weakness that immortal and better vigour be put forth with greater effect, and in my darkness the light of the divine countenance shine the more brightly: for then I shall be at once the weakest and the strongest, at once blind and the most clear-sighted; thus through this infirmity I shall be consummated, perfected; and through this darkness I shall be irradiated (*irradiari*).

These words are the prose counterpart to the lines on his blindness in the prologue to Book III of *Paradise Lost*, which, as Miss Brown points out, are not a lament or an appeal for pity but a hallelujah: otherwise they would be impertinent, coming as a conclusion to the triumphant hymn to light. The central thought is not, as many commentators suppose, what he has lost but what he has gained. 'It is no doubt difficult', as Miss Brown says, 'for the average person to realise that blindness has some advantages. But it is the realisation of these compensations that helps to make it endurable.' She quotes the testimony of other blind people in support of Milton's claim that the physical disability turns to intellectual strength: the blind are compelled to rely more on reason, imagination and memory in every activity, and being shut out from the show of life live more naturally and more intensely in the contemplative world. Thus Milton, returned to poetry, found that vision may thrive at the expense of sight:

And wisdom at one entrance quite shut out.  
So much the rather thou Celestial light  
Shine inward, and the mind through all her powers  
Irradiate, there plant eyes.

There can be no doubt that Milton meant every word of what he wrote

about his blindness: it was not just brave rhetoric in answer to the taunts of his adversaries. Thrown back on himself he gathered his powers to fulfil his lifelong purpose; by blindness he was indeed 'consummated and perfected'. He had come into his kingdom and during this last phase was surely, as Miss Brown claims, an essentially happy man. Consequently Miss Brown is able to show how foolish is the view that *Samson Agonistes* is dramatised autobiography. Samson is shown as dejected, helpless, beaten; contemptible to himself as to others; at times questioning God's justice, at others confessing that his blindness is a just retribution and himself the sole author of his ills. Can this be he, that heroic, that renowned, irresistible Milton? It is the very portrait his enemies wished to draw of him, and we are asked to believe that Milton has forgotten both them and himself. Certainly Milton's personal experience has gone to the creation of Samson, but Samson is a great tragic character and his story is handled with such firm dramatic control precisely because he existed only in Milton's imagination.

Miss Brown discusses the effect of blindness on Milton's versification, imagery and methods of working, and again she is able to correct out of her own experience the blundering surmises of other commentators. Many of her points would be fruitful topics, but I will mention only one. She observes that the blind exercise unusual vigilance in correcting manuscripts and proofs because they know both that the chances of error are so much greater and that all errors will be attributed to their special disability. This would explain how Milton's last poems came to be so correctly printed: editors have often been disinclined to believe the fact, it appears, on account of the cause.

Miss Brown is awkward at times in her handling of traditional literary English (one often wishes that American academic writers would take to the vernacular in the wake of their own literature); but this is a minor matter in view of the valuable material of her book. It has clearly been a labour of love, and she has the satisfaction of having made a unique contribution to the better understanding of Milton.

B. A. WRIGHT.

GLASGOW.

*Keats' Craftsmanship: A Study in Poetic Development.* By M. R. RIDLEY. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1933. x+312 pp. 15s.

Mr Ridley's purpose in this volume is to consider the development of Keats's art in the last eighteen months of his poetic career, to 'study his craftsmanship, watch his imagination at work on its materials, see what he was trying to do and how far he succeeded, watch him make his blunders and learn from them'.

In the introductory chapter he summarises Keats's view of himself and his art and discusses his methods of composition, defending Woodhouse's account against Miss Lowell and harmonising it with the extant manuscripts of the poems and with references in the letters. He then proceeds to examine the 'sources', 'materials' and 'workmanship' of most of the poems published in 1820; he investigates 'the direct suggestions in



[Keats's] reading or his observation', and the use he made of them, 'the development in metrical skill', 'the growth in power of presentation', 'the increasing security in the rejection and choice of verbal expression'.

Of the extant manuscripts—Keats's original drafts or fair copies, and the transcripts by his brother George and by Woodhouse—Mr Ridley has made full use. For 'sources' he has been able to draw (as did Professor de Selincourt in his fifth edition of the poems) on Mrs Ridley's unpublished dissertation. Using this, he shows keen detective instinct in noting parallels, in following up clues and in assembling them in support of his case. Thus he goes further than Professor Shackford in pointing out details which may have been derived from Mrs Radcliffe. Developing Professor MacCracken's suggestion of a debt in *The Eve of St Agnes* to *Il Filocolo* he calls attention to a French version of 1542 which Keats, if he had access to it, could read more easily than the original.

The treatment of the different poems is varied according to the material. Of *Isabella* Mr Ridley gives from Keats's holograph the text of the unrevised version, accompanying it with a critical analysis and running commentary and with Boccaccio's story in the English version of 1684 that Keats employed; he also cites passages from a French *traduction libre* of 1802 that presents some closer parallels. His discussion of *Hyperion*, because a full study is expected from Professor Lowes, is limited to a few special points, including the revision of certain passages in the manuscript. This method of 'look[ing] over the craftsman's shoulder while he is actually at work' is elaborated in the following chapter, much the longest in the book, on *The Eve of St Agnes*. Here Mr Ridley presents Keats's hasty first draft, with its many deletions and substitutions, and considers the purpose of the changes, studying 'the workings of the creative spirit in the throes of creation'. With this scrutiny of the manuscript he combines investigation of sources and literary reminiscences. Skillfully he shows 'Keats' imagination working on his material' and 'his technical skill labouring to secure the finished effect that he wanted'. This examination of the first draft of *The Eve of St Agnes* is followed by the text of the George Keats transcript, as giving the finished form of the poem before Keats, in Woodhouse's words, 'left it to his Publishers to adopt which [reading] they pleased, and to revise the whole'.

Passing to three odes composed with more leisurely care, *To Psyche*, *To a Nightingale*, *On Melancholy*, Mr Ridley appropriately treats them as experiments in devising stanzas based on the sonnet scheme, and as examples of 'distillation' (concentration of the essence of poetic richness and suggestiveness, as against the luscious exuberance of the earlier poems) and of rich and elaborate harmony. He emphasises Keats's achievement in *Lamia*, with its greater mastery of ordered narrative into which beauties are fitted unobtrusively, and with its fashioning of Keats's own form of the five-beat couplet, a form for which he takes hints from Dryden's *Fables* but does not merely imitate. In his discussion of *The Fall of Hyperion*, 'the last of Keats' great technical triumphs, the creation of his own blank verse rhythm', Mr Ridley examines the changes

that Keats made in some passages of the old *Hyperion* which he worked into his new attempt to handle the theme. The final chapter of this 'study in poetic development' exhibits the craftsman 'in the secure exercise of his powers' in the ode *To Autumn*.

This survey of Mr Ridley's volume can but indicate the general lines of his treatment. To illustrate adequately the wealth of detail that he draws from his scrutiny of the manuscripts, his ingenuity in interpreting it, and his alertness in detecting possible literary reminiscences, would require more space than the editor of this *Review* could well grant.

Here and there one may differ from Mr Ridley in reading Keats's handwriting and in interpreting the significance of alterations. For instance, in the two pages of the Harvard manuscript of *The Eve of St Agnes* which are reproduced in facsimile, *creamd* appears to have been altered for metrical reasons to *creamed*; and in the deleted beginning of stanza 32 the second word has not exactly the form *whispering* of Mr Ridley's transcript. But these are trifles; he is a keen-eyed, ingenious, and honest decipherer. Occasionally there is slipshod expression; often there are unhappy colloquialism, lively exaggeration, and facetiousness, which may be effective in the lecture room but in a published monograph are less amusing. Loose phonetic analysis and terminology spoil what might have been a good study of the harmonies of the *Ode to Melancholy*; the footnote on p. 234, while candidly admitting that "Alliteration" is used...to include what is more properly described as "assonance", does not add that 'long vowel' is also used to include what is more properly called 'diphthong'.

But Mr Ridley's 'study of the processes of Keats' creative imagination' is an able piece of industrious scholarship and of critical insight often expressed felicitously. In metrical analysis he is particularly good; and he has used the investigation of sources as a valuable instrument of criticism. His book is an important contribution to the appreciation of Keats.

The index is less accurate and adequate than might be wished. Thus it misleadingly suggests that an allusion to the revision of *The Eve of St Agnes* will be found on p. 242; and the Milton entry, which specifically names a number of poems, conceals beneath the bare page number 198 allusions to the *Sonnets* and to *Samson Agonistes*.

F. W. BAXTER.

BELFAST.

*The Pursuit of Death: a Study of Shelley's Poetry.* By BENJAMIN P. KURTZ. New York: Oxford University Press. 1933. xxii+339 pp. 13s. 6d.

How did Mr Kurtz come to choose the 'pursuit of death' as the right angle for a study of Shelley's poetry? No poet, it may be hazarded, has talked so much of death, both physical death and the death of the spirit, as Shelley did. But I imagine Mr Kurtz was first attracted to the more general theme, and that his thesis was to be the Romantic attitude to death. It is not really a morbid theme for death means here the negation

of the spiritual life, all that cramps and benumbs, and Shelley illustrates the challenge of the spirit to such evil forces better than any of the Romantics. Our author even claims for him a threefold conquest over 'death'. 'These three victories, ethical, aesthetic, and mystical—are the trophies of his furthest advance as poet.' That is Mr Kurtz's thesis—'the successive stages by which Shelley achieved his three victories over death'. The stages may be traced from *Queen Mab*, where the sick loathing of death is most pronounced, and *Alastor* with its romantic euthanasia, to *The Hymn to Intellectual Beauty* and the *Mont Blanc* poem, where a new serenity in face of death is first discovered. Thence to *Adonais* which marks the final triumph of the spirit over defeat and death. *The Triumph of Life* is indeed, as W. M. Rossetti pointed out, a brilliant disquisition on a line from *Adonais*, 'the contagion of the world's slow stain'.

This might be thought a rather unlikely angle for what is really a study of Shelley's poetry. And certainly Mr Kurtz, by his insistence on categories and phases, has done much to make the casual reader miss the solid excellence of his work. But patience brings its reward here, and before long we perceive that Mr Kurtz is a capable and sympathetic guide. I think, however, that his main theme might have been detached from the larger study of Shelley's poetry in which it is embedded. It could have been treated in much smaller compass, and would thus have gained in clearness.

Mr Kurtz is a whole-hearted worshipper of Shelley. Even his political and economic ideas which used to be such a stumbling-block are now seen to be eminently respectable, and the remarks of the older generation of critics on this head now appear mere foolishness. But Mr Kurtz hardly allows for the fact that the objection of enlightened criticism was not to the violence of Shelley's political opinions or his utopian ideas, but to the raw manner in which they were thrust into his early poetry. So far is Mr Kurtz from the true critical standpoint here that he actually defends Shelley's æsthetic approach to social questions. True, you cannot isolate the germ of poetry and Shelley is truly a poet of ideas, but the old complaint against his earlier works still stands that the ideas have not been sufficiently fused into his poetical experience.

I say Mr Kurtz is the perfect Shelleyite. Wherever honest criticism or splay-footed prejudice has announced shortcoming or failure, he is there with his shield. Nobody nowadays says the old stupid things about the lovely *Witch of Atlas*. We don't mind if the poet is merely allowing his fancy to run humorous riot there. But there are still people who will hesitate to regard *Epipsychidion* as 'the intensest of all romantic fusions of physical and ideal love'. For Mr Kurtz this poem is the supreme example of Shelley's æsthetic victory over death, that is over ugliness, fear of decay and physical death itself. People who talk of its 'disguised animality' or 'dream transferences' are simply nasty. I am not complaining of this faithful partisanship, especially when it is supported by so much intelligence. On the contrary. But partisanship should not betray the critic into, for example, the worst estimate of *Lycidas* since Dr Johnson wrote on that poem. The excuse is, of course, the desire to

elevate *Adonais*. 'The measure of its [*Lycidas*'s] fall is its uninspired commentary upon the futile, the minute, the mundane, which disfigures it. . . in reality it is but a superficial construction with neither romantic, infinite dream, nor classic confession of the limits of happiness'!

G. KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

*English Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century.* By B. IFOR EVANS. London: Methuen 1933. xxvi + 404 pp. 10s. 6d.

Professor Ifor Evans appropriately dedicates his book to Oliver Elton; and indeed it may be said to form, for poetry at any rate, a much needed bridge between the great *Survey* and the literature of to-day, for it brings us down not only to A. E. Housman and Arthur Symonds and Kipling (who are classed with the poets of the nineties), but to *The Testament of Beauty* also (with which, it is rightly said, 'nineteenth-century poetry comes to an end'). It is built on something like the same scale as the *Survey* (and does not therefore properly compare with the concluding portions of *The English Muse*); and it has something of the same quality, both as chronicle and as criticism. Could higher praise be found for such a book? In these days, when not only artistic criticism, but also the biography of artists and the history of art are apt to be the writer's subjective exclamation, it is pleasant and re-assuring to go along with Mr Evans, and to realise what it means to be conducted by *scholarship* through such varied and provocative country. For if such scholarship as Mr Evans's ensures tact and accuracy in the chronicle-part of his business, it makes no less for justice—yes, and for liveliness too—in the criticism. And the whole result, besides being invaluable informing, is infinitely more interesting than the most highly coloured notions of subjective prejudice can ever be.

Mr Evans well understands that, in such a work as his, chronicle and criticism must be combined; but that this is to combine two very different things. Accordingly, he has, as far as possible, kept them distinguishable in his book. The facts, biographical and historical, of the progress of English poetry from 1860 to the turn of the century, are fully set out, in admirably intelligible connexion. But these are also artistic facts, the value of which must be assessed. Absolute separation between chronicle and criticism is therefore impossible; and one may occasionally disagree with *obiter dicta*. Speaking of the Pre-Raphaelites, Mr Evans says: 'Millais, who had the discipline without the genius...'. Is he, perhaps, importing literary judgment into painting? Why, of all the Pre-Raphaelites, was not Millais the one and only, who, as a painter, had genius?—Mr Evans is certainly not one of those critics who must derive one man's art from another's. But when he finds 'the origins of Henley's irregular verse... difficult to ascertain', he seems unwilling to conclude that the origins are in Henley; and of the same poet's rhymeless verse in *Casualty*, he remarks that 'this is the verse of the Spanish ballads and folk songs, with the modification that they are governed by a liberal conception of assonance'. I am not quite sure what that last

phrase means, but is the movement of Henley's verse anything more than a variety of perfectly well-known English metre? But a delicate nose may smell influence a little too easily. Several times Mr Evans asserts Hopkins's influence on Bridges. I doubt if there is anything in this. As far as I can see, Mr Evans only defines this supposed influence in prosody. Now, except for his absurd nomenclature, there was nothing original in Hopkins's prosodic theory, nothing that Bridges could not have found out for himself. It needed no Hopkins to show that keenly investigating mind 'the licence by which varied feet could be introduced somewhat freely upon a basic pattern'. (*Licence* is not the word, surely, for a fundamental law in English prosody.) Hopkins's *practice* was, of course, profoundly original; but, it seems to me, unlike anything in Bridges.

It is only on such small points that I should be disposed, here and there, mildly to quarrel with Mr Evans. The book is an important piece of work, both as a finely organised chronicle, and as a body of sane and solid estimates. He is independent, and not to be taken in by reputation; but never eccentric. He does justice to several poets who, for one reason or another, are not generally allowed their proper rank: Coventry Patmore, James Thomson, John Davidson, for instance. And he is remarkably fair to the minor figures, such as O'Shaughnessy or Robert Buchanan or Edwin Arnold.

LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE.

LONDON.

*Oxford Lectures on Poetry.* By E. DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1934. 256 pp. 10s.

These are the lectures delivered by Professor de Selincourt during his occupation of the Chair of Poetry at Oxford, 1929-32, with the addition of his Warton Lecture on Keats for the British Academy (1921), and a recent essay on Wordsworth's *The Borderers*. As was to be expected, the volume is worthy of the series to which it belongs. It resembles its predecessors in treating, for the most part, of large themes and acknowledged masters. poetry itself in the inaugural address, and then Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Blake, Wordsworth, and Keats, with Robert Bridges admitted to the charmed circle as a great poet representing traditional procedure modified by enlightened modern experimentation. Incidental allusions to some other modern tendencies and phenomena show that Professor de Selincourt is not prepared to accept the high valuation which they occasionally receive. Where Bridges succeeded Gerard Manley Hopkins 'failed'; and there are chilling references to certain psychological theories which have sometimes been considered a source of strength for modern creative and critical literature alike; and to the exponents of 'realism' who may seem to be merely indulging a taste for ugliness. It is perhaps too soon to say how far these deprecations may be justified. But they are offered in the service of sanity and comprehensiveness. What is excluded, or regarded askance, is seen as something partial, 'damn'd like an ill-roasted egg, all on one side', unlike the work and the spirit of the

English classical writers, who saw life more roundly, who were exalted as well as chastened by the view, and whose art, in its serene and consummate matching of words to emotions or situations, reflected their nearer approach to wholeness of vision.

It is in this faith that Professor de Selincourt here writes of the poets of his choice. He praises Chaucer, among other things, for his awareness of the nobler elements in life, and his avoidance of 'the spurious philosophy which exaggerates the animal instincts as though they were the whole of man'. In *Troilus and Cressida* Shakespeare has for once narrowed his outlook and refused to exercise fully the powers that place him among the world's supreme artists, 'the discourse that looks before and after, the reason that is godlike, the imagination that illumines and does not merely expose'. Bridges is commended because, although he had no optimistic delusions, he recognised that 'man, the highest product of nature, is endowed with consciousness and judgment, and of what good is judgment if it does not choose the best?' Of poetic tragedy it is said finely and cogently that it 'has its source and inspiration in a passionate conviction of the inherent worth of human life, a conviction which is roused all the more keenly by the spectacle of the havoc and waste wrought by evil; and that beauty which finds expression in the ordered scheme of the poem and in the melody and imagery of its verse is but the outward and visible sign of the temper in which the poet has viewed his subject and interpreted its significance'.

Professor de Selincourt speaks much of 'beauty', and though he refrains from formal definition he makes it clear enough that it is something of which neither the appearances nor the appreciations are narrowly confined. 'Beauty is Protean in its shapes, and may reveal itself even in the grotesque.' He observes, however, that 'in the names of originality, sincerity, progress, it needs must be that offences come; and the loose form and ungainly phrase too often betray a state of mind in which thought and feeling are not wholly fused, as true poetry demands'. Here, of course, arises the endless difficulty of changing values. Offences may be perceived where in the long run none can be taken, and the loose form and ungainly phrase may represent a fresh poetic triumph which few, if any beside the poet himself, can rightly value at the time of its winning. Fortunately, too, there will always be room for variance of opinion as to what is more or less to be admired in the poetry of past ages; thus a defence might easily be made for Vaughan's phrase 'Stars shut up shop', which in Professor de Selincourt's view blemishes an attractive passage. But while it is indeed allowed that 'Beauty is Protean in its shapes', and while the nature of poetry is as amply conceived as it is in this initial lecture, the risks of critical incomprehension may be met without too much anxiety.

Professor de Selincourt more than once suggests that poetic quality defies analysis. But there are happy pages here in which the technique of word collocation or metrical ordering is skilfully illuminated; and critical art is not less apparent in the selection of illustrative passages which are allowed to speak for themselves or receive but little comment. The

author's long-proved ability to exhibit with freshness, insight, and enthusiasm the merits of English poetry is seen to have suffered no abatement. The performance is too level to make easy the signalling of particular passages, though it would be pleasant to dwell upon such things as the defence of Spenser against his detractors or the comparison of Blake and Wordsworth. It should be added, too, that the value of the volume is enhanced by its inclusion, in full, of the recently discovered Preface to *The Borderers*, discussed in its bearings upon the growth of Wordsworth's mind.

L. C. MARTIN.

LIVERPOOL.

*Word-studies in French and English.* By T. ATKINSON JENKINS. (*Language Monographs of the Linguistic Society of America*, No. XIV.) Baltimore: Waverley Press. 1933. 94 pp. \$1.35.

This is a mixed bag of twenty items. The longest is an article on the sense development of the noun *novel*, which the author traces, via Italian and Old Provençal, to an original connotation 'speech, dialogue, or string of speeches, distinguished for freshness and originality'. The nineteen etymological articles vary considerably in length and importance. The unexplained O.F. *aner* (*Roman de la Rose*, 3473) is referred to L. *aerem*, influenced in stress by G. *ἀέρα*. This suits the sense of the line. O.F. *aoi*, imper. of O.F. *aovre*, L. *\*ad-augere*, used something like a musical *ff*, is less easy of acceptance, and Engländer's suggested *\*adaudi* seems quite as reasonable. F. *besoin*, earlier *bosoin*, Professor Jenkins would dissociate altogether from *soin* and derive from L. *obsonum*, 'soldiers' rations or pay', G. *ὀψώνιον*, with metathesis of the first syllable. The same metathesis is postulated for several other O.F. words, e.g., *bestance*, from *obstantra*, *beslonc* (now *barlong*), from *ob(s)longum*, etc. F. *bis*, It. *bigio*, are referred to L. *buteo-n-*, 'hawk with brownish-grey plumage', via a form *\*buis*. The argument that the *piere byse* of *Roland*, l. 2300, is in assonance with *u* or *ui* is rather spoilt by the fact that at l. 2338 it is in a pure *i* assonance. *Contretemps* is claimed to be a mistaken spelling of *contretant*, pres. part. of O.F. *contrestier*; cf. *entretemps*, for *entretant*, *inter tantum* (*Dict. Gén.*). Professor Jenkins would connect both F. *cocu* and E. *cuckold* with L. *cuculus*. This is one of the cases where phonetic obstacles have to give way to common sense. He leaves the origin of the synonymous O.F. *cous*, *coup* undecided. F. *disette* from L. *disjecta* was already hinted at by Littré.—'From the idea of dispersal flows easily that of scarcity'; cf. *pabulatio...cum exigua tum disjecta* (Cornelius Nepos). O.F. *anor*, *enor*, 'ear-ring', is, as given by Meyer-Lubke, L. *inauris*; Professor Jenkins supplies two examples of this rare word, one from *Eructavit*, the other, wrongly entered by Godefroy under *honor*, from *Le Chevalier au Cygne*. The article on O.F. *escalibor*, Arthur's sword, gives numerous instances of the prefixed *es-* by means of which 'a certain heightening effect is sought'; a familiar example is *escarboucle*. In the *Bataille des Sept Arts* of Henry of Andely the author has found an odd example of the dim. suffix *-et*, pl. *-ez*, so common in *Aucassin*, used as a

nonce-word to indicate the juniors. The rhyme *feire* (L. *fōria*): *paire* (L. *pareat*) in Marie de France's *Fables* is utilised to suggest a possible Angevin origin for the poetess and identity with an Abbess of Shaftesbury who was the illegitimate daughter of Geofroi V, Count of Anjou. Professor Jenkins does not regard all our *guns* as descendants of the famous Domina Gunhilda, the mangonel of which we have record at Windsor Castle in the fourteenth century. He points to *engon*, a Hainault (Mons) variant of O.F. *engan*, from *enganner*, 'to deceive', which he would derive from L. *canna*, 'reed', with an original sense of 'bird-call'. It is, at any rate, probable that our first guns, including Mons Meg, came from Hainault. The *gon-s* which he quotes from Baudouin de Condé seems to me of very dubious interpretation. O.F. *ense*, 'tax, dues', in *Guillaume de Dole*, is a Picard spelling of O.F. *hanse*, the familiar German word. Professor Jenkins would derive both *harnais* and *lanière* (O.F. *lasmère*), whence our *lanyard*, from Germanic *\*nast*, pl. *\*nesti*, 'strap', to be inferred from the modern *nestel*. The O.F. variants of *harnais* would represent *hernast*, *-nesti*, 'army-strap(s)', and *lasmère* a metathetic form of O.F. *nashère*, from *\*nastila* + *aria*. Both these etymologies seem very problematical. O.F. *Melite*, contrasted (*Eructavit*, 462) with *Egypte*, was explained by A. Thomas as *terra mellita*, 'land flowing with (milk and) honey'. Professor Jenkins prefers to see in it a mystical reference to Malta as a place of refuge after escape from peril (*Acts* xxviii, 1). The most interesting article, perhaps, is an attempt to establish the etymology of the mysterious *sedan*. And here one may remark with regret the absence of any concerted effort by philologists to clear up some of the numerous words described by the dictionaries as 'of unknown origin'. Worse still is the dictionary habit of reproducing, without discussion, old guesses which have no foundation. Johnson's 'first made at Sedan' is perpetuated by Skeat and even in Professor Wyld's *Universal Dictionary* of 1932, although rejected by the *O.E.D.* Professor Jenkins would derive it from Sp. *sillón*, 'a lady's saddle', also (1594) 'a sedan', taken to Sicily and Naples, at that time virtually a Spanish city, and then undergoing the transformation of *-ll-* to *-dd-* which is common in Sicily and lower Italy. The suggestion is interesting and, at any rate, the first attempt to deal seriously and historically with the word. Lastly, Chaucer's *vitremyte*, in the *Monk's Tale* (B. 3562), for which the *O.E.D.* is satisfied with saying 'of obscure meaning', and which Professor Jenkins would connect with *vitta* and *mitra*, for both of which there is ample early evidence in the sense 'fillet' or 'snood'. There is, however, something to be said for Skeat's 'glass head-dress, in complete contrast to a strong helmet', inexplicable as the allusion may be. *Galea vitrea* is used by Boccaccio, *howe of glas* is found in M.E., and Chaucer's version of 'those who live in glass houses, etc.', is.

Who that hath an heed of verre,  
Fro cast of stonnes war him in the werre!

(*Troilus*, II, 867.)

E. WEEKLEY.

NOTTINGHAM.

M.L.R. XXX



*The Language of the Eighth Century Texts in Northern France. A Study of the original documents in the Collection of Tardif and other sources.*  
By MARIO A. PEI. New York City. 1932. xx+405 pp.

For those who approach French from the angle of Classical scholarship there is one disappointment in store. They may for a time have hopes of being privileged to watch Latin slowly evolving from Plautus to Gregory of Tours and finally blossoming forth into the most 'delitable parleure' of mediæval Europe. But soon comes the awakening to an unhappy fact. Between Latin, however 'Late' or 'Vulgar', and French, however 'Old', there is a great gulf fixed, and it is bridged only by the shadowy speculations of the learned. The written documents before 842 remain, for all their grammatical inexactitudes, Latin. The Strasbourg Oaths of 842 are, for all their primitive characteristics, essentially and undeniably French. They are the first outward sign of a new order of things in the linguistic world (Latin six-case system discarded, passive forms lost, future gone, etc.: see *Old French Grammars passim*). Yet among the hundreds of documents prior to 842 that have come down to us, not one reveals in its entirety the existence of the new morphological structure which compels us to classify the Strasbourg Oaths as French and not as Vulgar Latin.

A Romance language was born in Gaul before 813. The official intimation, the first definite one, was made in that year, unwittingly, by Charlemagne when he differentiated between *lingua latina* and *lingua romana rustica*. But how long before?—Hundreds of years before, probably in the sixth century, respond the orthodox—and tell us once again the cheerless, not altogether convincing, story: how one general language was used throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire—at least in inscriptions, how the fall of the Empire, leading to rapid disintegration of spoken Latin, soon brought about Romance dialectisation; how between the Latin texts of the eighth century and Old French there was once a 'missing link', a gradually diverging spoken form of Latin, unrecorded in any written document, how it imperceptibly became, say about the sixth century, an independent language and lived thereafter a mysterious, strictly oral, life till a few brief and soldierly sentences were committed to writing in 842—and are to be found, in a more or less accurate form, in a manuscript of a hundred years later.

Recently a refreshingly heterodox theory has been put forward by Professor Henri François Muller of Columbia University: that consciousness of a new Romance language in Gaul began not very long before 813, say about 780; until then the language spoken by the people whom we now call French was none other than that which we find in the written documents. He believes that the political and intellectual unity of the Roman Empire merely became the moral and spiritual unity of Christianity; Latin stood fast as the language of Christendom (even the Germanic invaders soon adopted it) and, till about 780, people naturally continued to speak it approximately as they wrote it. In other words, he gives the Latin documents of the eighth century their face value. He considers their language to be, within reasonable limits and with due

allowance for traditional orthography and technical phraseology, a fairly accurate representation of the spoken language. And now his disciple Dr Mario Pei brings to his support the results of a detailed study of the eighth-century Latin texts.

These are in fact the crux of the problem. Their language, in the orthodox view, is a purely artificial one, based on attempts to write Classical Latin and largely unaffected by whatever developments were taking place in contemporary popular speech. If this is true, then their divergences from Classical correctness are 'errors', more or less haphazard, due to mere ignorance and consequently of no great interest to Romance philologists, who remain free to believe that by the eighth century people in Northern France were already speaking a sort of proto-Romance tongue. In Dr Muller's view, the language of these texts is a living, organic one, not only incorrect, but systematically so, in the sense that its incorrections are reducible to laws, i.e. it had its own rules and its own grammar. If this is shown to be the case, the assumption will be that it developed naturally, *pari passu*, along with the spoken form, separated from it only by the differences there must always be between speaking and writing, and that in the eighth century the language of the people was still 'Vulgar Latin', which term thus acquires a new and quite unorthodox sense.

To test the soundness of Dr Muller's view, Dr Pei examines the language of documents belonging to different periods of the eighth century, selected from Tardif, *Monuments historiques* (1866) and checked on Lauer et Samaran, *Les diplômes originaux des Mérovingiens* (1908). These have the advantage of being well preserved and authentically dated, belonging to one single linguistic domain, Northern France, and falling chronologically into clearly marked groups: I, 700-717, when there is no *historical* reason for supposing the scribes to be intent on writing 'good Latin'; II (after a gap in the extant material), 750-770, when it is known that Pepin, probably while as yet only Mayor of the Palace, was impressing on scribes the desirability of more correctness in their Latin; III, 770-812, when the movement towards linguistic reform inaugurated by Pepin was completed by his son Charlemagne. But these texts have also, for Dr Pei's purposes, grave disadvantages. They are nearly all royal charters, wills, deeds relating to donations, transfers of property, etc. Being important official documents, they were certainly written by the most learned scribes of their time. They are restricted in subject-matter, formal in tone, full of archaic locutions, legal phraseology and traditional spelling. Consequently they provide slender and unpromising material from which to draw conclusions as to the true state of the language used at the time by people in Northern France.

In four massive chapters, Phonology, Morphology, Syntax and Vocabulary, Dr Pei examines the material critically. Of his results, fully documented, tabulated, supported so far as possible by statistics and collated with the results obtained by other scholars, the most interesting perhaps are these. Until the period when external reforming influences are known from other sources to have come strongly into play, the texts

show no traces of artificiality due to a desire for Classical correctness, but a slow progressive lowering of Classical standards. The first linguistic reforms of Pepin and Charlemagne affected spelling and, as a consequence, morphology—not syntax, which remained for long corrupt. The use of the possessive pronoun is fully Romance (extension of *suus* to refer to any singular possessor, and of *eorum*, occasionally *illorum*, to denote any plural possessors, regardless of case, and the almost complete disappearance of *ejus*). The use of the subject pronoun does not materially differ from Classical (or, for that matter, from O F.) usage, i.e. the pronoun is generally absent, being employed only for emphasis. *Ille*, at first often explainable as ‘the aforesaid’, is in the second half of the eighth century increasingly used in the double function of definite article and personal pronoun. The Romance future (*habere* + infinitive) is completely absent; all futures, however, tend to be avoided throughout, for the law is not fond of that tense. The accusative and infinitive construction is found alongside indicative or subjunctive clauses (as indeed in Old French), but there is a growing tendency to use *quod*. The Plural of Majesty in the second person does not appear till 787, in a report to Charlemagne (earlier instances can be explained away, e.g. because writers are addressing an abbot *and* his community). In vocabulary there are changes, chiefly semantic—in the direction of French meanings.

Reviewing the evidence as a whole, Dr Pei concludes, perhaps rather confidently, that there is throughout his three groups, in chronological order and corrected only partially by the reforms of Pepin and Charlemagne, a slow gradual development, along definite lines, towards the creation of the Romance tongue of the Strasbourg Oaths. This persistent lowering of Classical standards, others ascribe—arbitrarily, he says—to growing ignorance of Classical Latin on the part of the scribes. He ascribes it—somewhat arbitrarily also, we fear—to ‘the single factor of the progressive and parallel development of the spoken tongue’. In what others call ‘haphazard errors’ he sees definite transitional stages from Classical Latin to Romance. He considers the language of his texts to be a living organic tongue ‘bearing every mark of being not merely written, but spoken as well, and spoken not by an intellectual *élite* alone, but by the vast mass of the population’.

His work is not a triumphant confirmation of Dr Muller’s thesis, but does on the whole support it. At what point in his conclusions Dr Pei outruns the evidence it is difficult to say. He has shown, we think, in the language of his texts a trend towards Romance, not perhaps in such regular chronological order as he maintains, but definite if we make generous allowance for the unknown quantity represented by Pepin’s reforming tendencies and for the severely official character of the texts available. In the eight centuries which separate the Classical period from the Strasbourg Oaths there must, theoretically, have been at some time or other a point at which we could say, ‘Hitherto Latin writers wrote more or less as they spoke; henceforth their language becomes artificial’. This stage Dr Pei puts at a very much later period than most scholars, though they, to be sure, gain little enough by throwing it back

to an earlier. We do not say that he is wrong—merely that, to us, the linguistic evidence adduced seems insufficient to warrant such exact dating. He may be right—in his impressions. It may well be that similar studies of the Latin texts belonging to other linguistic domains may produce collateral support from other Romance languages. It may well be that should there ever come to light a series of chatty letters written (from 768, under Pepin, to 788, under Charlemagne) in a private capacity by Hitherius the scribe, during office hours, to Hitheria... But meantime the eighth-century documents available are not such as are likely to yield many secrets on the relations between the written and the spoken language in the eighth century. The enquiry was well worth making. We are grateful to Dr Pei for having made it, and while deploring the fact that the scales are so heavily weighted against him by the very nature of his texts, congratulate him on an admirably lucid, scholarly and stimulating piece of work.

R. L. G. RITCHIE.

BIRMINGHAM.

*Prologue and Epilogue in Old French Lives of Saints before 1400* By PAUL JOHN JONES. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania. 1933. 65 pp.

Saints' lives have not yet received from the historian of literature all the attention to which they are entitled; they often contain details of social history that it would be impossible to find elsewhere. Mr Jones has confined himself to the prologues and epilogues and has analysed the information to be found therein concerning the use and purpose of the lives, the sources and personality of the authors. He summarises his findings and shows that the general characteristics are as follows:

The prologues examined contained one or all of the following divisions:

- Plea for silence, invocation of God.
- Statement of the value of the lives of the saints and the edifying example they offer.
- Reference to source.
- Assertion of absolute veracity

The epilogue, on the other hand, is composed of the following elements:

- Prayer to the saint whose life is told.
- Exhortation of the audience to pray for the author.
- Name of the author.

It goes without saying that very few of the lives exhibit all these features. The most constant are the plea for silence, invocation of God, and reference to a written source in the prologue, while the epilogue, in a large majority of cases, consists merely of a prayer at the end of the poem.

Stated baldly in this way, Mr Jones would not seem to have added much to what Petit de Julleville wrote in the first volume of the *Histoire de la langue et littérature de la France* some 40 years ago or Gaston Paris (*Litt. fr. au moyen âge*) rather earlier still (1st ed. 1889), but it is useful to have information concerning publications up to 1927, at which date Mr Jones concluded his researches.

For the basis of his enquiries Mr Jones takes very naturally the remarkable article on saints' lives in verse published by Paul Meyer in vol. xxxiii of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, but he does not tell us exactly how many of the 230 poems there enumerated he examined, so far as I can see he mentions by name about 50, one could have wished that he had given us a bibliography of texts utilised, since it would have been more satisfactory to have been able to form an opinion of his success in extracting the information accessible.

Mr Jones insists perhaps too exclusively on the fact that verse saints' lives were destined to be read aloud, that reading aloud at meal times was a very common practice in conventual establishments is well known, it was prescribed by the Rule of various orders and stated quite definitely in the Welbeck MS. (cf. *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, vi, p. 476), in many orders it was the precentor's duty to provide not only material for reading aloud but also for private recreation and study.

In the second and third chapters Mr Jones considers the purpose of the mediæval hagiographers and their introductory remarks. These are generally the commonplaces of the moralist—the wickedness of the world to-day, all is not gold that glitters, etc. It is here that we feel that Mr Jones has not made full use of the published material. The interesting prologues to Saint Osith (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, 1911), St Richard of Chichester, St Mary of Egypt (*Revue des langues romanes*, 1910 and 1917) and Saint Rémi (London, 1912) have been either neglected or rejected, although the first named is mentioned on p. 47 in another connexion.

Mr Jones' fourth chapter deals with the poets' references to their sources, he concludes that the writers are in general honest in claiming some Latin source even though modern editors have sometimes failed to find such sources; he instances very properly the great care that a conscientious poet like Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence took to document himself adequately when he came to write the life of St Thomas of Canterbury. All that the writers lacked was a critical sense, an ability to distinguish what was probably true from what was palpably false. Mr Jones might have pointed out that what really interests us to-day is not the Latin source itself but the additions made by the poet (see Gaston Paris in *Vie de Saint Gilles*, S. a. t. fr., p. xxxvi seq.).

One of the characteristics of saints' lives is the uncompromisingly critical attitude adopted by their writers towards profane literature; all genres seem to be condemned in some life or other. When Mr Jones says that the 'compositions mentioned by name are: *Partonopé*, *Lays* of Marie de France, *Chansons de Charlemagne*, *Chanson des Sarsnes*', he is surely underestimating the number; 'Chansons de Charlemagne' might designate quite a number of epic poems. Further when he draws up a list of 'proper names' he limits this to the names of six persons; this is surely a wrong limitation to assign to the word 'proper' but it seems clear that only by an afterthought has it occurred to Mr Jones to mention names; there are many names in the lives of St Rémi, St Martin of Tours and Chardry's Josaphaz.

In chapter vi—'The author and his profession'—Mr Jones' 'remarks on

language' (i.e., the author's own remarks) are extremely meagre; he should have consulted Professor Vising's *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature*, Oxford University Press, 1923.

In chapter vii—'Personal indications'—Mr Jones points out that about one in four of the authors tells us his name; it is not clear how this number (67 out of 230) is arrived at, there are not 67 different authors named in Paul Meyer's article, but to those names there mentioned should be added Peter of Peckham, author of *St Richard of Chichester* (*Revue des langues romanes*, 1910, pp. 245-6), and Marie, authoress of *St Audry of Ely* (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, vi, p. 476).

We cannot feel that Mr Jones has added much to the sum of our knowledge; the work could, we think, have been much better done by a more personal and first-hand treatment of the material at his disposal. There seem also to be confusions in his notes, e.g., he quotes (p. 22) as *Ste Catherine d'Alexandrie* two lines from the version of Gui, and under the same title (p. 29) from the version of Clemence of Barking. It would be fastidious to criticise all Mr Jones' quotations, but he is sometimes exasperating. He quotes from the earliest version of St Alexis, but from what text or edition? What he prints (p. 31) corresponds to none of the following: MSS. *L.A.P.*, original edition of Gaston Paris of 1872, revision of 1885, new edition of 1903, edition in the series *Classiques français* of 1908 and subsequent years.

A. T. BAKER.

SHEFFIELD.

*Étude philologique sur la langue, le vocabulaire et le style du chroniqueur Jean de Haynin.* By MARTHE BRONCKART. (*Académie Royale de Langue et de Littérature françaises de Belgique. Mémoires*, vii.) Bruxelles: Palais des Académies. 1933. 306 pp.

The language of a writer of the middle of the fifteenth century who writes, as he tells us 'non point pour cause que je soye en riens clerc, facteur ne retorisien, ne apris de tel chose ferre', is likely to repay study and this is certainly the case with the memoirs of Jean de Haynin. He is (for us) so agreeably unlettered that he uses his local speech with relatively little adulteration and, what is perhaps more important, is so untrained in orthographical tradition that his spelling often affords valuable indications of the pronunciation of his time. Students of fifteenth-century French and of the form it assumed in the northern region will find much to interest them in Mlle Bronckart's work, and not infrequently readers of Anglo-Norman will be struck, as so often happens,<sup>1</sup> by the interesting parallels that can be drawn between the speech of this region and that developed in England.<sup>2</sup>

Among the features that are of interest to students of fifteenth-century French I would call attention to the following: (1) the lowering of *û* to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pope, *From Latin to Modern French, with especial consideration of Anglo-Norman*, pp. 437, 448, 475

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially the treatment of final consonants and of *ə*, and the wealth and freedom of analogical formations, e.g., *leutre ± nostre*, p. 204, *tenut*, p. 228.

ø (*eu*), e.g., *eunble*, *commeun*, *pleume* (pp. 55, 112); (2) the frequent effacement of prae-consonantal *r* (e.g., *destoubé*, p. 166, *plorette* for *plorerte*, p. 224, and conversely *tourpiant*, p. 183), (3) the effacement of final *r* in the endings *-er* and *-ier*, pp. 69, 151; (4) the treatment of final consonants: effacement and liaison (*passim*), (5) the instability of *ə* final, both post-consonantal and post-vocalic, cf. the spellings *pas* for *passe*, *frer*, *bruyers*, etc., and conversely *mite*, *piete*, *parte*, *euse*, *leure* for *mat*, *piet*, *part*, *eus*, *leur* (p. 152 and cf. below).

Mlle Bronckart has given us a detailed and very careful study of Jean's linguistic usage; she is evidently well versed in the speech of the northern region and its literature and makes excellent use of her knowledge; the textual emendations suggested are usually perspicacious and convincing, sometimes ingenious, her treatment of vocabulary<sup>1</sup> and dialect ordinarily clear and competent. I am, however, not inclined to fall in with the explanation she offers of the origin of the termination of the third persons plural, the most interesting of Jean's local idiosyncrasies because the most unusual (pp. 208-15). Mlle Bronckart ascribes to metathesis the curious use of *-te* for *-ent* in these persons<sup>2</sup> (e.g., *viente*, *venoite*, *vinrte*, *vinsste* for *venient*, *venoient*, *vinrent*, *vinssent*). I would rather ascribe this ending to the influence of combined phonological and orthographical tendencies: the tendency to develop a vocalic glide in the heavy group of consonants formed often by the effacement of *ə* and the desire to indicate the pronunciation of the final *t*, cf. the varieties of spelling cited on pp. 212-13: *-tte*, *-ete*, *-ent*, *avotte*, *vindrete*, *dorvente*, etc.

The weak side of the work is the inadequacy of the writer's acquaintance with the older language and contemporary *francien*. Fuller knowledge of these would have enabled her to deal more clearly and interestingly with some subjects (e.g., the development of the diphthongs *ie* and *au*, the effacement of *r* and *s*) and prevented her from making dogmatic assertions about French usage that it would be difficult to substantiate (e.g., on the use of final consonants, p. 57, of forms like *consaus*, *osteus*, p. 189, *vindrete*, p. 228, *vinssse*, p. 231, the article, p. 239) and from treating as individual or local idiosyncrasies traits that are either survivals of older usage or widespread (cf., for example, the remarks on *print*, etc., p. 111, *merancolie*, p. 175, *pieur*, p. 190, *il(s)*, p. 194, *dorent*, p. 217, *illeuc*, p. 245, the use of *as* for *aux*, pp. 74, 193, of the stressed forms of personal pronouns, pp. 197-200, on the order of words, pp. 260-2). Earlier linguistic usage, I would add in passing, does not bear out the ingenious theory she propounds of the origin of the locution *lun huitième*, p. 239, for the earliest instance I have noted (in the *Roman de Thèbes*, l. 9087) is *sei tierz* (third person).

These defects, and some others of like nature, are the result of inadequacy of equipment not of confused thinking; they are readily detected by the more experienced and in spite of them Mlle Bronckart's study is a

<sup>1</sup> *bages*, p. 157, is evidently the modern *bagues*, rings, and *fournisier*, p. 170, a derivative of O.F. *formiz*, for the derivations of *frieite*, p. 85, *fester*, p. 118, substitute *fremitum*, *\*festidare*.

<sup>2</sup> For the reduction of *-ent* to *-et* in Middle French, cf. Pope, *op. cit.*, pp. 170, 340.

useful contribution to our knowledge of the language of the period and gives proof of very considerable philological aptitude.

M. K. POPE.

MANCHESTER.

*Érasme et les Débuts de la Réforme française (1517-1536)*. By MARGARET MANN. (*Bibliothèque littéraire de la Renaissance*.) Paris: Champion. 1934 xix + 228 pp. 40 fr.

From the time of his student days at the Collège de Montaigu, Erasmus remained in close touch with his friends and correspondents in France; and French writers, for their part, Humanists, Reformers and free-thinkers, all experienced the charm of this great, independent spirit. Miss Mann has restricted herself in the present volume to a study of Erasmus's relations with the principal French Reformers, a subject forming, as it were, a complete chapter in the history of sixteenth-century thought. During the twenty critical years that elapsed between 1517 and 1536, she explains how Humanists and Reformers, who had begun by close collaboration, and were often, at the outset, indistinguishable from one another, were gradually led to follow different paths, until for Erasmus the Reformation as conceived by Calvin appeared a stumbling-block for literary culture, while for Calvin the Humanists—to whom he owed so much—were counted as one of the four kinds of 'Nicodemites' and even, in time, as enemies more dangerous than the Catholics.

The surprising thing is, not that Erasmus exercised so little influence on the course of the Reformation in France as that, for a long time, he was listened to with so much sympathy and respect. For his attitude in some ways anticipated that of many nineteenth-century thinkers. From literary studies to the study of the Bible and to the practice of the Christian life was, in his mind, a natural transition. Europe needed the text of the Bible, as she needed the text of classical authors. 'Whenever you meet with something that is true, believe that it comes from Christ'—this sentence from the *Enchiridion* illuminates the whole of Erasmus's attitude. As for religion, it was not so much a matter of dogma as of conduct and of the inner life. Erasmus had no liking for disputes regarding dogma, he felt that this was the wrong handle by which to take up the religious question.

In successive chapters of her book Miss Mann traces the history of Erasmus's relations with Lefèvre d'Étaples, the 'groupe de Meaux', Farel, Louis de Berquin, and Calvin; the figures of Luther, Melancthon and Zwingli appear from time to time in the background. It is a story of growing estrangements. We see the great Humanist, established from 1521 in the congenial 'milieu' of Bâle, striving to prevent a breach between Reformers and Catholics, recommending moderation, and rewarded by the hostility of both Luther and the Sorbonne. For a time, it is true, Louis de Berquin, in his translations of Erasmus (of which Miss Mann makes a scholarly analysis), attempted to reconcile his teachings with Luther's; but the burning of Louis de Berquin in 1529 severed the last strong link between the Reformation and Humanism. Henceforward the



fissure grew wider every year. Calvin had been deeply indebted to Erasmus for his biblical criticism and his editions of the Fathers, but Calvin's temperament and outlook were leading him into another climate from that in which Humanism flourished. Theology and literary culture seemed to him to be in different categories. Erasmus, on the other hand, saw no real disparity between them. The difference between Erasmus and Calvin was, as Miss Mann observes, a difference of character. It was also, in a sense, like a difference of epoch. Calvin was a 'representative man' of the sixteenth century, whereas Erasmus frequently gives one a sensation of the nineteenth, he appears, again and again, as a precursor of the author of *Literature and Dogma*.

Miss Mann's book is well documented and written in good, smoothly-flowing French. The index might have been fuller, the bibliography, however, affords a detailed and valuable guide to work on the period. But the present work is more than a good dissertation, more even than a portrait of Erasmus. It is a series of portraits from each one of which the man himself seems to emerge into life, with his thoughts and aspirations, and even his anxieties, we see him holding steadily on his lonely course as he is revealed in these pages by a disciple who has remained, like him, cool and moderate amid the clamour of controversy.

A. LYTTON SELLS.

DURHAM.

*A dramatic adaptation of Rabelais in the Seventeenth Century. Les Aventures et le Mariage de Panurge (1674) by Pousset de Montauban, with a Study of his Life and other Plays.* By MARION F. CHEVALIER. (*The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, Extra Volume VI.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford. 1933. 196 pp. 10s.

Les œuvres dramatiques de Pousset de Montauban (2 tragédies, 2 tragi-comédies, 1 pastorale, 1 comédie) sont de mince importance dans l'histoire de la littérature dramatique française du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle; Marion F. Chevalier a cependant fait œuvre utile en imprimant la comédie encore inédite de cet auteur. Celle-ci, quoique assez maladroitement construite et par surcroît obscène par endroits, est un centon de Rabelais qui présente un certain intérêt. Les caractères paraissent bien faibles et bien ternes à côté des originaux, Frère Jean en particulier est méconnaissable. Mais il y a de la facilité, une certaine verve assez amusante quelquefois: la scène la plus curieuse de toute la comédie est la scène 4 de l'acte III (v. 1121), qui semble être une excellente parodie, avant la lettre, des énumérations de V. Hugo, et en particulier de la scène des portraits de *Hernani*.

L'édition est faite avec beaucoup de compétence et de soin,<sup>1</sup> l'éditeur

<sup>1</sup> On est porté à croire que l'éditeur a quelquefois mal déchiffré le MS.; par ex. il faut probablement lire: v. 142 *la*, et non *le*; v. 275 *en*, et non *et*; v. 1141-2 *l'art*/ Du célèbre aloyau, et non *lard*, note du v. 1265 à un, et non *d'un*; v. 1972 *battant*. Quelquefois l'éditeur a corrigé à tort la leçon du MS. v. 547 conserver *jour* (ce même mot est employé dans un sens analogue au v. 1231); v. 904 note, supprimer *[sic]*; v. 1018 lire probablement 'tu te remarqueras'; v. 1132 conserver *échalotte*; v. 1170 lire *empestrer*. L'orthographe a été moder-

a consacré une cinquantaine de pages, fort intéressantes et instructives, à son auteur et à ses œuvres. c'est un travail consciencieux et qui lui fait honneur.

F. J. TANQUEREY.

LONDON.

*Qu'est-ce que le classicisme?* (*Essai de Mise au Point.*) By HENRY PEYRE.  
Paris. E. Droz. 1933. 229 pp.

Il est remarquable que chaque génération semble éprouver le besoin de donner sa définition du classicisme, ou peut-être de se définir elle-même en prenant position par rapport à celui-ci, le petit livre de M. H. Peyre est une de ces tentatives, et l'une des plus intéressantes. Assez naturellement, l'auteur s'attache de préférence au classicisme français, littérature et beaux-arts. A plusieurs reprises, il exprime vigoureusement la conviction, qu'il n'est pas le seul à posséder, que l'étude des grands écrivains français du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle est presque entièrement à refaire; en attendant toutefois les études de détail qui nous aideront à reviser les idées généralement acceptées, l'auteur a isolé et mis en bonne lumière les traits les plus généraux du classicisme français. Il était admirablement préparé pour la tâche qu'il s'était assignée, il était muni d'une somme de connaissances aussi variées que précises, et son érudition se meut aussi à l'aise dans le vaste champ des littératures grecque et latine que dans le champ plus vaste encore des littératures européennes modernes. Les idées les plus importantes se trouvent condensées dans la quatrième section,<sup>1</sup> qui est comme le cœur de ce petit volume. Naturellement, et le titre l'indique bien, l'auteur ne prétend pas épuiser en quelques pages un sujet aussi vaste et aussi divers il y a quelques omissions,<sup>2</sup> mais pour la plupart volontaires ou de médiocre importance. On peut aussi ça et là relever des idées quelque peu hasardées ou insuffisamment nuancées.<sup>3</sup> Mais en général, on ne trouve qu'à admirer; l'auteur a de son sujet une connaissance intime, et à l'érudition il joint un goût très fin, un jugement très sûr, une originalité de bon aloi. Son livre est nourri d'idées justes plutôt qu'ingénieuses, et donne constamment matière à réflexion; c'est un travail que maîtres et étudiants devraient également étudier et méditer. Les tables et la notice bibliographique sont excellentes.

F. J. TANQUEREY.

LONDON.

nisée, ce qui est très justifié; mais alors il faut écrire v. 135 *aveuglement*; v. 268 *dégoûtant*; v. 322 *angues*; v. 2223 *ces vilains*

La ponctuation est parfois défectueuse, souvent au point de faire disparaître le sens, ou d'introduire des incorrections grammaticales: v. 685 supprimer la virgule; v. 697 lire *battu*, tout vif j'e, v. 786 lire: *Et frère Jean, Bombec, enfin*, v. 851 lire. *au cœur*; il se; v. 1201 lire: *autres, en habits à la mode entendus*, v. 1467 lire: *Puisque, monsieur présent, vous*

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 48-104

<sup>2</sup> Par exemple le respect de l'auteur classique pour son œuvre et pour son lecteur, l'absence totale de toute charlatanerie.

<sup>3</sup> M. H. Peyre me semble rabaisser à l'excès l'importance des écrits théoriques et ne pas prendre assez au sérieux les prétentions moralisatrices de tous les classiques français

*Philarète Chasles, critique et historien de la Littérature anglaise.* By E. MARGARET PHILLIPS. Paris: Droz. 1933. 309 pp

Philarète Chasles was a pioneer of international literary criticism, as well as the most sympathetic interpreter of English literature in France in the middle of the nineteenth century. Both through his articles and the brilliant lectures which attracted enthusiastic audiences to the Collège de France, he was undoubtedly a leader of thought in his time; to-day he is, if not forgotten, relegated to a secondary place among critics. Miss Phillips, in her interesting and scholarly study of Chasles, seeks to account for his immediate success and his subsequent eclipse. The first part of her book is devoted to the life and personality of the critic. Reliable documents are sadly lacking, and Chasles himself has in many cases misled the unwary among biographers. Miss Phillips has reviewed the available information with scrupulous care, rejecting the apocryphal matter and putting us on our guard against the unreliability of autobiographical information in the *Mémoires*, which she only accepts when corroboration can be found in authentic records. To give one example, Chasles claimed to have been in Edinburgh when *Waverley* appeared, whereas he did not leave France for the first time until three years later.

Temperament and education account in part for his want of intellectual and moral stability. His father was a moody and violent man, declamatory, suspicious, extreme in his views; the educational experiments to which he subjected the young Philarète might well have unbalanced a less sensitive lad. They culminated in a technical apprenticeship, in accordance with Rousseau's theories, to a printer who had failed and whose part in an anti-royalist conspiracy led to the arrest of the young apprentice and his imprisonment in the Conciergerie. Soon after his liberation Philarète went to England, where for seven years he lived and worked among the lower middle and working classes. Miss Phillips stresses the value of this period in the development of Chasles and points out how much better he was qualified to judge of England than Taine who came with preconceived ideas and only met the ruling classes. Chasles learned to admire the English respect for individual liberty and the moral solidity of the nation, which he, unlike many foreign critics, believed was genuine. Miss Phillips in her account of the life of Chasles after his return to France shows how domestic and financial considerations drove him to those multifarious activities which, while they increased his immediate reputation, dispersed his energies and prevented him from producing, like Sainte-Beuve, his colleague at the Mazarine, great and enduring works.

The second part of the book is devoted to an examination of Chasles as a critic. The general tendencies of his criticism are brought out, its historical and social bias, and its relative indifference to form. He foreshadowed Taine and Brunetière in several of their main theories, but he escaped the errors to which both were led by the too rigid application of these. Such prejudices as he had, while they narrowed his field, did not warp his judgment. He is chiefly important for the independence of his criticism, its freedom from allegiance to party or school, and for his unprejudiced

interpretation of English and American literature in France. Whereas even the most sympathetic of his predecessors had judged English literature by French standards, he had a truly international outlook. He was the first in France to recognise many great English authors, for example, Defoe, Cowper, Lamb, Carlyle, Keats and Shelley; the first to study Shakespeare for himself instead of using him for polemical purposes.

Miss Phillips has given us a study which is none the less interesting for the scrupulous sobriety of her scholarship; from it emerges the figure of a restless, unhappy, at times unbalanced man, who was nevertheless an independent, honest, fearless and competent critic.

M. E. I. ROBERTSON.

LONDON.

*The Complete Works of St John of the Cross.* Translated from the critical edition of P. SILVERIO DE SANTA TERESA, C.D. (Burgos, 1929-31), and edited by E. ALLISON PEERS. Volume I: *Ascent of Mount Carmel, Dark Night of the Soul.* London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 1934. lxxvii+486 pp 15s.

With this first of three volumes Professor Peers initiates a labour of love conceived over eight years ago. The moment is opportune. The new interest in Spanish mysticism that post-war disillusionment has fostered throughout Europe, having confirmed Santa Teresa on her pinnacle, is now engaged on raising an even more exalted one to St John of the Cross. M. Baruzi and P. Bruno de Jésus-Marie have been prominent among the builders on the side of exegesis and biography. P. Silverio, come too late to lay the foundations, sets the coping-stone on the edifice with his new edition of the complete works. P. Silverio's finds and findings had indicted earlier texts of such deviation and adulteration that only now can one feel within reasonable distance of what St John of the Cross really wrote. And if, as appears probable, his text is definitive for Spain, the version before us is likely to prove so for English readers. For half a century that of David Lewis has served the non-specialist well, but verbal niceties are more than quibbles when the theme is so ethereal that the author's whole literary activity is one long struggle against the insufficiency of language. Out of this struggle come the involved paragraphic sentences, the constant paraphrastic redundancies, as too the amazing range of simile and metaphor, all eloquent of a clutching after the impalpable that at times, and in the measure of the vividness and depth of the writer's personal experience and gift for self-analysis, does work the miracle. In mysticism the author's finer shades of meaning and subtleties of dialectic are of vital importance, and, given now a satisfactory text, translation calls for just such a wedding of scholarship and devotion as Professor Peers here brings to the saint 'to whom, indeed, I owe more than to any other writer outside the Scriptures'.

Appreciation of the style of St John of the Cross, even more than of that of Santa Teresa, thus rests on appreciation of his difficulties, and even so must remain a highly personal matter. It is of interest to note how Professor Peers has himself lingered long over his attitude towards it. In

1924 he is non-committal: 'to the intellect at least' St John of the Cross is clear (*Spanish Mysticism*). In 1927 the judgment is adverse the saint's style 'for the most part . . . tends to be obscure, and thus makes harder to read what in itself is of sufficient difficulty' (*Studies of the Spanish Mystics*). In 1932 this gives way to an emphatic *démenti* 'The idea, commonly held and not infrequently expressed, that he is vague and obscure in his prose works is entirely mistaken' (Rede Lecture, *St John of the Cross*). By means of a scrupulously faithful translation, which professes to sacrifice stylistic elegance to exactness but in reality is remarkably felicitous throughout, and by his modesty in leaving P. Silverio in full charge of the prolegomena, even when he might differ on points of detail such as the influence of Ruysbroeck (cf. p. xlv and Rede Lecture p. 74), Professor Peers now stands aside while readers judge for themselves. The fact that St John of the Cross has never evoked, and could doubtfully give rise to, such a masterly literary study as that of the Abbé Hoonaeert on *Sainte Térèse, écrivain* would seem to be indicative of the relative importance of the two saints to literature—in his general introduction P. Silverio devotes two pages out of forty-seven to considerations of style—and in sympathetic humanity *la santa* must always take precedence. But this edition is not addressed primarily to students of letters. St John of the Cross speaks only to souls like-minded, if rarely like-gifted, and the spiritual discipline he offers scorns compromise with the frailties. One is tempted to say that the approach is now made easier, if anything, for English than for Spanish readers, to whom the saint must remain a sixteenth-century author. To make it easy is as impossible as it would be undesirable.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON.

GLASGOW.

*Les 'Novelas Exemplares' de Cervantes en France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Contribution à l'étude de la Nouvelle en France* By G. HAINSWORTH. (*Bibl. de la Rev. de Litt. Comp.*, No. 95.) Paris Champion. 1933. 298 pp. 45 fr.

If the circumstances that favoured the influence on France of Spanish literature in general and Cervantes in particular throughout the seventeenth century have always been clear, it is only of late, and especially within the last four years, that the full consequences of Cervantes for French literature have begun to be explored. Herr Neumann and Miss Crooks have given valuable general surveys of the field, M. Bardon has traced the echoes of *Don Quixote* down two centuries. Now Mr Hainsworth, limiting himself to the *Novelas Exemplares* and one century, has produced a work of solid scholarship which should modify considerably a chapter of French literary history. He has the richest theme; for whereas appreciation of the real significance of *Don Quixote* came very late in France, and the plays inspired at most sporadic imitations, with the *Novelas Exemplares*, published in French within a few months of their appearance in Spain—the First Part of *Don Quixote* had to wait nine

years for a complete version—the tracing of translation and imitation is the lesser part of the story. The tale here is one of literary influence in the full sense of the term, of a definite impulse determining the course of a genre and leaving its imprint on authors who may never have heard of Cervantes. Such an influence, as it seems to us, Mr Hainsworth fully establishes.

The study of the *Novelas Ejemplares* in themselves and of their popularity in France thus occupies little more than one-third of Mr Hainsworth's text. It begins with an admirable analysis of their significance in the history of story-telling that will rank as a pendant to Icaza. Briefly, 'd'une part, [Cervantes] enseignait à raconter, avec le maximum d'effet, une histoire déjà intéressante en elle-même. De l'autre, en revendiquant les droits de l'artiste, il libérait le genre de l'esclavage des intrigues extraordinaires, et rendait possible la nouvelle moderne, dont la base n'est souvent qu'une série d'incidents banals, une scène de mœurs, ou un caractère'. Incidentally, the conviction that Cervantes was always conscious of his effects suggests to Mr Hainsworth one more interpretation of the much discussed epithet *ejemplares*, it being borne in mind that it is in the paragraph of the prologue following his defence of the word that Cervantes makes the claim, now admitted, to be 'el primero que he novelado en lengua castellana'.

Mr Hainsworth's sub-title and the remaining two-thirds of his work are devoted to the study of the displacement of the Italian *novella*, till then pre-eminent in France, in favour of this new preoccupation with form, truth (of whichever Cervantine variety), and subjective commentary. The Italian tradition, if it did not succumb at once to the onslaught—Mr Hainsworth takes into account not merely Cervantes but his derivatives in Spain in the *novela*—was soon recognised as effete. The worthy Camus, attracted to Cervantes by the relative propriety and probability of his themes in comparison with those of the Italians, gives two of the reasons for his popularity. The Spanish influence, moreover, has the greater persuasiveness of the contemporary; the Italian goes back to Boccaccio and is so stereotyped as to preclude development into something new. Thus, from the point of view of the literary historian, even the *Contes* of a La Fontaine must go by the board: 'Tout aussi invraisemblables, au fond, que les pires productions romanesques et sentimentales, ces récits misogynistes repêchés dans la littérature d'un autre âge n'ont rien à voir, pour la plupart, avec le développement de la nouvelle moderne'. Sorel (*Nouvelles Françaises*, 1623) is to Mr Hainsworth the true founder of the short story in seventeenth-century France, and his works and opinions testify throughout to an increasing respect for Cervantes. With him in this are Scarron and Segrais, and between them the trio hand on the genre to the second half of the century fully formed in the new mould and destined to a phenomenal popularity. After 1700 Boccaccio and the *novella* return to a measure of favour, but the new potentialities, if no longer consciously attributed to Spain, remain definitely incorporated in the art of the short story.

A forty-five-page bibliography reinforces the text in its promise that

Mr Hainsworth's handling of his theme will prove to be definitive. His reading in it has certainly been exhaustive.

WILLIAM C. ATKINSON

GLASGOW.

*The Modernist Trend in Spanish-American Poetry.* By G. DUNDAS CRAIG. Berkeley. University of California Press, London Cambridge University Press. 1934 xii + 347 pp. 18s.

This book consists of a selection of Spanish-American poems, beginning with Silva and Darío, and continuing up to the present day. Each poem is translated into English verse on the opposite page. There is an introduction of a general character, and at the end there are biographical, critical and expository notes on the works of each poet represented. The book is written for a wider public than the purely academic, being the work of an 'aficionado' who wishes to introduce his favourite poems to new readers.

Rubén Darío is the most famous of the poets in this anthology, and Mr Craig has selected fourteen poems that represent the different types of poetry cultivated by him, though we are rather surprised to find that one of his best poems, the *Marcha triunfal*, has not been included. None of the other poets in this collection have either the historical or the æsthetic importance of the Nicaraguan. This is not the place to attempt a complete evaluation of all of them, but I may be allowed a few lines about some of the principal figures. Silva's *Nocturno III* is a poem of considerable importance. Nervo was much influenced by Darío, but is not entirely without originality. The selection from Lugones would hardly justify the high reputation that he enjoys, although there is an interesting use of imagery in *El solterón*. Santos Chocano is a rhetorical faker, both in his early bombastic manner and in his later, would-be-simple *Tres notas del alma indígena*. Herrera y Reissig is much more serious, and his poem *La cena* is good and refreshingly free from the sentimentality, which is only too obvious in several of the poets whom Mr Craig has singled out for praise. Neruda, Huidobro and Borges, the three youngest poets included, have considerable talent and show promise for the future. In nearly all, however, there is to be noted a certain lack of discipline and of a settled native tradition. There does not seem even to be much of a popular tradition on which these poets can draw, as García Lorca and Alberti have done so brilliantly in Spain. Nor have any of them the careful workmanship and economy of method of Guillén or of Salinas. In fact Latin-American poetry of the twentieth century does not appear to be so important as modern Spanish poetry.

The introduction gives a general account of the origins of the Modernist movement, in South America and in France, and goes on to give the history of later movements up to the present day. Unfortunately Mr Craig has little to say that is new, and his prose is often very careless.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g. 'The Symbolist was not content with the objective viewpoint of the Parnassian, nor with his seeming coldness. He sought for something deeper, something that would touch the heart. For him the world was full of signs and wonders, if he could only read them. The germ of modern Symbolism (for Symbolism is no new thing in literature: it is

The same defects, combined with more redeeming qualities, are to be found in the notes at the end of the volume. Here Mr Craig is more specific, and some of his expository notes are useful to the reader who is new to the field, prosodical matters for instance are treated in detail, perhaps in too great detail. There is, however, one very weak spot in the author's critical equipment—a lack of knowledge of contemporary literature in other countries, which would have given him a valuable scale of reference<sup>1</sup>

The translations, like the notes, are sometimes useful in solving the difficulties of the original. Unfortunately though, they are seldom good enough to stand on their own feet, and they would have been still more useful in good prose. Mr Craig says, 'The modern poet—and particularly the Parnassian—insists... on the music of his verse; and it is but fair that the translator should attempt to reproduce some of the effect at which the poet aimed... As far as possible I have tried to retain the rhythmical and musical qualities of the original' (p. xi). But this use of formal metre and rhyme often leads him into awkward places. As an example I quote the first stanza of Darío's *Canción de Otoño en Primavera* (pp. 54-5).

Juventud, divino tesoro,  
¡ya te vas para no volver!  
Cuando quiero llorar, no lloro,  
y a veces lloro sin querer...  
O Youth, divinest of treasures,  
No more to return art thou fled;  
When I fain would weep, I weep not,  
And oft tears unwillingly shed!

The translator has successfully expressed the thought (such as it is) of the stanza; but the rhyme has compelled him to abandon the simplicity of language, the contrast of the verbs *querer* and *llorar* in the third and fourth lines. It is in such uses of language, as much as in formality of rhythm and rhyme, that the effectiveness of poetry lies. Largely because of this dependence upon his rhyme-words Mr Craig sometimes uses words (such as 'boon', 'teen', 'churl', 'fain', 'bourne', etc.) which at one time were suitable for poets, but are now so many dead counters, except in very special circumstances. Also I dislike the translation of the Spanish second person singular, in modern love poems, by the English *thou*.

The defects of this book make it impossible to recommend it unreservedly. But in the hands of the wary it may prove a useful introduction to twentieth-century Spanish-American poetry.

EDWARD MERYON WILSON.

CAMBRIDGE.

as old, at least, as Ezekiel and the Song of Solomon) is to be found in a sonnet by Baudelaire, who, though in general a Parnassian, had in him the soul of a Symbolist.' p. 9.

<sup>1</sup> His only authority for modern English and American poetry is Amy Lowell's *Tenderness of Modern American Poetry*, and references to English and American poets later than Browning, Poe and Whitman are almost non-existent. Nor is this ignorance confined to the English-speaking world. Juan Ramón Jiménez is referred to merely as 'a Spanish follower of Darío' (p. 284), and Paul Valéry is only mentioned to be put alongside Tzara, Reverdy, Dermée and Cendras as the French writers whose work 'is in line with' that of Huidobro (p. 334). A queer sort of line it must be!



*The German Language* By R. PRIEBSCHE and W. E. COLLINSON. London: Faber and Faber. 1934. xvii+434 pp. With 8 Plates and Dialect Map 18s.

Authors, general editor (Prof. G. E. K. Braunholtz) and publishers must be congratulated for bringing out, as the third volume of the enterprising series *The Great Languages*, this masterly survey of the German language.

This is the first historical grammar of German that one can recommend to students with confidence. The older English works give little beyond phonological rules and paradigms, the German works, intended largely as works of reference, offer a wealth of detail entirely unsuited to any but the most advanced students; moreover, it must be confessed, their detailed treatment frequently leads to the neglect of broader issues. The expert can supply these from his own background, the student is confronted with a bewildering mass of isolated phenomena. By concentrating on the main facts and by the method of presenting general surveys of a given field (cf. e.g. chapters on Loan-words, Standard Languages, Spelling and Punctuation) the authors have successfully avoided the inevitable drawbacks which arise when grammatical subjects are treated exhaustively in several volumes. From the Preface it appears that the book is intended to serve partly as an introduction to the larger German works, and the authors express their indebtedness for all that these works have taught them. It would be easy to overstress this indebtedness, for in any serious scholarship it is imperative that one should consult and utilise earlier studies in the same field. The material has been gathered for anyone to use it who cares to and the authors show on every page that although they know their authorities they know much besides.

Quite apart from the method of rapid surveys there is one important aspect in which this book differs markedly from its learned predecessors. Being intended for English students there are constant cross-references to English usage and development, and, whenever this is helpful, there are also sidelights on Dutch, Frisian and Scandinavian development. The German language is thus not treated in isolation and the method employed opens up much new ground in Germanic comparative grammar. It was not within the scope of the book to deal minutely with these comparative problems, all that could be done was to point the way to further study. Much of this comparative material, found on almost every page throughout the book, is entirely new and not the least result of the authors' suggestive treatment will be further and more detailed research by English students into problems such as the development of common vocabulary, the development of meaning and range of common prefixes and suffixes, the underlying causes determining parallel or divergent semantic development.

Another respect in which the book differs is in that it makes use of the results laid down in works such as Schrader's and Hoops' *Reallexika*, and draws on the modern discipline of *Volkskunde* whenever this seems necessary, and thus presents to a large extent the cultural history of the

Germans as reflected in their linguistic development. In Part I (pp. 1-82) the reader is not plunged immediately into complicated rules of consonantal and vocalic change but is given two chapters, one on Indo-European background, the other on The Germanic Peoples, which, whilst giving the requisite technical information, constantly remind him that he is dealing with the peoples and the languages they created and moulded, not merely with linguistic labels. The third chapter discusses the Forms and Sounds of Germanic in a scholarly though sometimes too condensed fashion. Here the harping back to the older and more leisurely method of presentation would have been of advantage.

The first three chapters of Part II (pp. 85-235) are devoted to the phonological and morphological development from O.H.G. to Modern German. The detailed consideration of the High German Soundshift is preceded by parallel biblical extracts in Low and Middle German which familiarise students with the main features of the important dialect division (pp. 86f.) and at the end of the Phonology (p. 131) a note deals with parallel vowel-changes in English. The chapter on Inflexions (pp. 132-205) has been much condensed without sacrificing clarity. O.H.G. and M.H.G. are, however, dealt with separately. This seems a pity. The 'straight' development of substantival *a*- and *i*-stems, for instance, could be treated in the same historical manner as the development of stressed *a* and *i*, parallel tables could show all types (when preserved) at the different stages, and a section at the end could deal with contamination and the emergence of new types. The same method could be employed with advantage for the other parts of speech. Apart from the saving in space this would help to impress upon the student that labels such as O.H.G. and M.H.G., in spite of the weakened unstressed vowels and the mutations of the latter, are linguistic conveniences and that German has not taken several jumps but has developed constantly and gradually. Chapter III: Word formation (pp. 206-235) reverts to the historical method. Composition and Derivation are explained, and affixes and methods of composition are then taken separately and traced from the earliest to the most modern time.

Chapter IV: Loan-Words and Foreign Words (pp. 236-250) and Chapter V: A Survey of the German Vocabulary: Native Elements, Proper Names, Group Dialects, Changes of Meaning (pp. 251-273) introduce material into the study that has never before been presented in English, and on account of the lucidity of treatment and the large amount of comparative Germanic matter these chapters will occupy the attention of even the most exacting expert. Chapter VI (pp. 274-320) is reserved for Syntax, a study that has lately received a new impetus through general theoretical findings and through Behaghel's detailed and fully documented *Deutsche Syntax*. But the four volumes of Behaghel, excellent though they are, are even more of a work of reference than the grammars of Wilmanns and Paul, and the present authors, by severe reduction and the minimum of quotation, have produced an introduction to syntactic study that is a model of its kind. There is again a good deal of comparative Germanic material, and in this respect the chapter goes

far beyond what is offered in Behaghel and prepares the way for further and fruitful comparative research.

Chapter VII (pp. 321-328) discusses German dialects. The authors have gone to a good deal of trouble to find illustrative material, and after the short discussion of the main features of each dialect works are cited in which the dialect may be studied. This reference to the printed word is of far greater value than would be a detailed and necessarily abstract analysis, and the method once again shows the realistic manner in which the task has been tackled.

Chapter VIII (pp. 329-351, excellent bibliography at the end) treats of the development of German standard languages. The term *deutsch*, the problem of the *Karolingische Hofsprache* (with an illustrative side-light on late ninth-century West Saxon), the M.H.G. *Dichtersprache* the influence of the chanceries, the activity of Luther and the difficulties Luther's language encountered in the South for confessional reasons, *Sprachgesellschaften*, eighteenth-century standardisation, the modern problems of *Schriftsprache*, *Umgangssprache* and *Buhnenaussprache* all these are adequately dealt with, and much besides, in a well-balanced essay of barely twenty pages.

Since, in historical times, linguistic study is dependent on MSS. and books, no apology is needed for the introduction of Chapter IX: A Short History of German Handwriting (pp. 353-382). Excellently reproduced plates—an essential pre-requisite for paleographical work—have been prepared from photographs taken by Mrs H. M. S. Stuart so that the student is better able to form a judgment. Unfortunately, there is no plate giving samples of German handwriting from the seventeenth century onwards. The chapter closes with a reminder that 'Gothic' script is no more German than *antiqua*, both being developments from the Carolingian minuscule.

Chapter X: Spelling and Punctuation (pp. 370-382) might have been called 'historical orthography'. The difficulty early scribes found in dressing German sounds in a Latin orthographic garb is well brought out. For Punctuation there is far less evidence in earlier times and what there is of it is frequently of doubtful value. The authors rightly suggest that far more information needs to be collected before a proper history of German punctuation can be written.

There is a concluding chapter on the Genius of the German Language (pp. 383-396) which has many interesting suggestions. An attempt is made to deduce from German linguistic phenomena an inherent conservatism and a love of order. The orderly mind of the German is possibly well shown in the fact that, apart from 'impersonal' verbs which are naturally limited to the third person, German has no 'defective' verbs (cf. e.g. the pret.-pres. verbs in English and German).

Dr A. Closs has supplied an Index to Germanic Words, a thankless task conscientiously executed, and a good dialect map is given at the end of the book. The map would, however, have been better if a third colour had been employed. There is too much red in it.

In conclusion, a few doubts and suggestions. On p. 3 Alexander

Hamilton's share might be mentioned, the conclusions drawn on p. 16 might be made a little more problematic, especially since the limiting 'seems clear that' occurs on the previous page. The picture of Germanic civilisation given on pp. 19-22 is built up by drawing on sources well over a thousand years apart and much of it is probably Northern rather than Germanic. The Indo-European consonantal system given on p. 41 would look less forbidding if it were arranged in tabular form. The problem of the relative chronology of the Germanic Soundshift is not dealt with on pp. 48ff., nor is any relative chronology of Verner's Law attempted. On p. 53 the term *ablaut* appears for the first time and from now onwards it is constantly being used as a stylistic variation of 'gradation'; similarly, *umlaut* is frequently used for mutation, and on p. 154 we even find 'umlaut-producing'. Repetition of technical terms is unavoidable in technical works. Why not use the English terms throughout? The section on Accent (pp. 59ff.) might have preceded the section on Unstressed Finals (pp. 56ff.). This would have made clear to students why final syllables in Germanic were reduced. Less than a page (p. 58) is spent on West-Germanic doubling of consonants which seems too little, especially in view of the far-reaching effect this doubling had on related words in German. Doubling before *n* is not mentioned at all. The discussion of 'stems' (p. 63f.) is too condensed, nor is anything added on p. 132 where 'stems' are taken for granted. The classes given for the pret.-pres. verbs on p. 78 differ from those given on p. 146. After the mention of Notker's 'canon' (p. 94) a few lines from this author would have made things much easier. On p. 97 the date of the modern *tw:zw* shift is not given, nor is any general reason offered to account for modern German *t* where we expect *d*, and *d* where we expect *t* (p. 102). *Ader*, *Bruder*, *Busen* and *Ekel* are not exceptions to the rules stated (p. 130), a table of adjectival declensions would be helpful on p. 139, on p. 141 Notker's weak use of *ander* might have been mentioned. Throughout the O.H.G. section there is no consistency in the use of *e* for 'old' *e*, and here, as elsewhere, the use (or non-use) of asterisks needs checking. On p. 164, paragraph 5(β)*n*-stems, an example of the type is given in brackets. This practical method could be extended, with advantage, to all similar cases. On p. 176 one misses a reference to types like *Album* and *Schema*, on p. 178 there is no mention of a type like *Villa*. Adjectival *wa-/wō*-stems should have been included on p. 183f., and there might be a discussion of *ein* and its M.H.G. usage on p. 185. Since the table on p. 191 deals with modern conditions, *scheiden* should be listed under i, not under vii. On p. 192 it is stated that (in strong verbs in modern German) 'we find that the present and past participle are in the main kept distinct from the preterite and from each other'. This is only true of two (iii and iv) of the seven classes. When dealing with adjectival suffixes (p. 224) *-bar* is referred to M.H.G. *-baere* rather than to the adverbial *-bäre*. On p. 245 might be added that German frequently has *der Keks/die Kekse*. When mentioning, on p. 250, that 'the Franconian dialects have left their mark on French' a few examples might be given, particularly of words that passed from French into

English (type-guard), also there might be a cross-reference to p. 33, note 1 where a number of examples is cited. Terms like *meschugge* and *Schlamassel*, known to every German, should perhaps be added on p. 261, the latter term particularly on account of its interesting origin (*schlamm* plus Hebrew *mazol*). On the same page *Geheimssprachen* are mentioned, and the *bi-language*, current in St Gall during the first half of the fifteenth century, is adduced. A quite modern example is the *aw-language* (disyllabic, *a* a vowel, *w* a consonant) which is still talked in German schools: *Kannst Du die aw* (pronounced *aweh*) *Sprache sprechen?* becomes *Kawannst Dawu dawie aweh-Sprawachawe sprawechwawen?* In the enumeration of school-slang (p. 263) one misses the universal *Pauker*, *Schlauch* is more usual than *Spicker* for a 'crib', and *verpetzen* 'to sneak' rather than *petzen*. There is little that changes as rapidly as slang, and many of the words given in Kluge's *Deutsche Studentensprache*, to which students are referred for further details, are no longer understood by present-day students. 'The dative took over the functions of the old instrumental' (p. 290) needs qualifying, since in the plural what we call 'dative' is historically an 'instrumental'. Is not *föhēm wortum*, strictly speaking, as good an 'instrumental' as *dīnu speru*? The one exceptional *oo* (*Boot*) might be added on p. 371, *Vehikel* (p. 375) has a voiced initial consonant. The Index to Germanic Words needs an introductory statement explaining that mutated vowels are glossed as unmutated vowels, that *ae* comes after *ad*, that verbs appear in the infinitive form, and that verbal prefixes are often disregarded in glossing when the simple verb also occurs in the text.

As linguistic studies developed it was inevitable that the phonological and morphological problems investigated should become more and more minute. Far too much of this relatively unimportant research has passed over into text-books. Since Phonology and Accidence are the indispensable background of historical grammar, University syllabuses tended to become more and more overweighted, a state of affairs by no means confined to the study of German. It has been difficult, up to now, to avoid this over-emphasis as there was no reliable guide to put into the hands of students. This book, which stresses all important aspects and overstates none, will allay the misgivings of student and lecturer, and it is destined to have a far-reaching and beneficial influence on linguistic teaching in our Universities.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

*The Earliest Relations between Celts and Germans.* By C. S. ELSTON.  
London: Methuen. 1934. x+198 pp. 7s. 6d.

This book is a reprint of a laboriously written doctor's dissertation, in which the author seeks to throw light on the actions and reactions upon each other of the Celts and Germans in primitive times. Taking up a challenge from the side of the historians, Dr Elston endeavours to decide the question on purely linguistic grounds, and by summarily dismissing the historical and archaeological evidence he is able to devote the main portion

of his book to a discussion of the threescore or so Germanic words or proper names for which a Celtic origin has been claimed. With the help of etymological dictionaries the Germanic and the Celtic forms are traced back to a hypothetical Indo-European type, or types; their meanings and possible ranges of meanings are explored, and parallel sense developments are considered—even in totally unconnected words—in languages as remote as Sanskrit or Zend. The conclusion indicated is that in practically all cases the two forms are independent offshoots from the same original stock.

The dangers of such methods are obvious. On the one hand there is the temptation, in which the author is apt to fall, of hazarding some daring etymologies that are often neither relevant to his argument, nor likely to command respect—and on the other hand no really definite conclusions are possible—the more so because the refinements of modern comparative philology have swept away such criteria as the quality and quantity of the vowel in the group of words represented by the Gothic *reiks*—and indeed in several cases others have drawn diametrically opposite conclusions from similar premises. On the whole Dr Elston is not lacking in caution, as, e.g., when he writes 'the conclusion to be drawn is that Germanic *burg* (sic!) is either not related to Celtic *\*brig-*, or is cognate with it'. Sometimes, however, his zeal gets the better of him, especially when he is combating opposing views, and later on he uses his results as arguments towards proving that, while the Celts and the Germans must have been in close touch for countless centuries, and a fusion between them must even have taken place across their frontiers by Roman times, the theory of a Celtic domination must be rejected in favour of one that postulates a considerable amount of trade and commerce between the two peoples.

Dr Elston has the requisite knowledge of the methods of Comparative Indo-European philology, but a fairly large number of slips and inconsistencies make it apparent that he does not possess the necessary control over some of the languages he uses. In particular the Sanskrit forms are given in a haphazard fashion, or—to come nearer home—there are many mistakes in the Old English examples. He is guilty too of resuscitating *Hertha*, 'the false goddess who for many years drove out the rightful deity from the fortieth chapter of the *Germania*'—to borrow Professor Chambers' happy phrase.

The bibliography is fairly complete, but the same cannot be said of the index, which consists of no more than two pages filled with a medley of forms.

A. O. BELFOUR.

BELFAST.

*Die Personenbeschreibung im höfischen Epos der mhd. Epigonenzeit.* By DUNCAN M. MENNIE. Kiel. 1933. 154 pp.

This diligently compiled dissertation collects the descriptions of men, women and monsters for works that lie between *Wigalois* and *Friedrich von Schwaben*. Part I lists the details of the descriptions (pp. 5–89) in an orderly alphabetical manner under headwords that make reference a

simple matter. Results are summarised, pp. 89-96. Part II (pp. 97-143) gives a list of descriptions and discusses them under somewhat mechanical headings. Part III (pp. 144-151) surveys the whole field and gives an all too short characterisation of the methods and peculiarities of the various poets. Further literature on similar subjects is cited, pp. 152-153. The conclusion is reached (p. 151) that there is no real difference in the description of persons at the beginning and at the end of the chosen period.

Now all this is very laudable work and there is a mass of information in the thesis which students of thirteenth-century court-literature will welcome. Yet it seems a pity that the scope of the enquiry was so limited. There are dissertations dealing with the description of persons in the epic up to Gottfried, in Gottfried's *Tristan*, in Hartmann's works, in *Parzival*. And in reading through the quotations one is struck again and again by reminiscences, verbal borrowings and by what we should now call plain theft, though admittedly mediæval authors had other notions on that subject. It would have been instructive if these influences had been followed up in detail. Another aspect, not touched on, is the inter-relationship of the *Epigonen*. It is to be hoped that Mr Mennie will continue his research and present some results that bear on these wider and more interesting problems.

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

*Wolfram von Eschenbach: A Study of the Relation of the Content of Books III-VI and IX of the Parzival to the Crestien Manuscripts.* By Sister MARY ALOYSIA RACHBAUER. Washington: The Catholic University of America. 1934. xii+263 pp

'The aim of this investigation'—so runs the preface—'is to find out which of the extant French MSS. or types or groups of MSS. Wolfram used as a source or sources for his *Parzival*.' There follows a further elaboration of this under six importantly worded headings. To the accomplishment of her task the authoress brings, however, no more than a journeyman's industry, uninformed by any spark of critical acumen or imaginative insight. She is handicapped further by an imperfect command of the English language: her stiff and commonplace style, strewn with unconscious banalities and deviations from traditional usage, is that of a foreigner writing without natural freedom in an acquired tongue. 'Parzival runs from the outdoors to his mother weeping. . . For Wolfram's Parzival all three knights rank as gods, but one is especially outstanding for his beauty, one who is following as the fourth knight. . . Herzeloide is anxious to keep Parzival at home in order to have a chance to give him some lessons. . . Herzeloide informs Parzival that proud King Lahelin has robbed the countries of Wales and Norgals. . . Wolfram however is here not probably humorous. . . Wolfram here, contrary to what scholars often claim concerning his religious attitude, is rather pious. . . Parzival is chided by the hermit. . . Trevrizent tells Parzival that a trip to Munsalvæsche is very dangerous'—and so on.

Nor is the writer's knowledge of Middle High German free from obvious errors. For example: 'Sea air is somewhat soothing to Anfortas' pain'.

A dissertation composed under these conditions makes profitless reading; and we cannot attach any value to the results thus gained. Every point is laboriously noted, the findings of Lichtenstein, Golther, Hilka, and others, are re-affirmed; and the writer contributes her own discovery, based on a strange and perverse interpretation of Wolfram's text, that Parzival 114, 5-116, 4 was inspired by Crestien's dedication to Count Philip of Flanders. With the final concluding statement that 'the best types of MSS. for Wolfram are "L", "H", "P", and the Prose', there is no need to quarrel; but the *Anhaltspunkte* or 'points of critical value' amassed include more puerilities than can be numbered, and are not to be accepted as serious proof.

'The field is vast. Many workers are needed for its thorough exploration' We may add, that some sound preliminary qualification is also needed.

MARGARET F. RICHEY.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY

*Wesen und Formen der Erzählkunst.* By ROBERT PETSCH. Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1934. 346 pp. 11 M.

This extensive treatise on the Epic worthily continues Professor Petsch's profound studies—unfortunately not all easily accessible—on the nature of Tragedy, on Dramatic Theory, and the analysis of poetic works. It hardly comes as a surprise to those who have watched the gravitation of the author's interest towards the more exact delimitation of literary *genres*. His latest work certainly demands and may truly claim the close attention of the reader, who will, however, find his labour richly rewarded by the stimulation of a new interest and the acquisition of much valuable knowledge drawn from the author's wide reading and sagacious interpretation. Here it is possible only to outline the contents and point out some of the more significant problems treated.

The work falls into (a) a general part dealing with the theoretical pre-suppositions of Epic and the discussion of its essential features in contrast to those of other literary forms, and (b) a special part which demarcates the various types of Epic. A narrative (*Erzählung*) is defined as a coherent communication of past facts transcending mere news and capable, at least secondarily, of producing an aesthetic effect. It thus goes beyond purely factual reports as represented, e.g., by bulletins, official notifications, or entries in a diary. Its springs are to be found in reminiscences of striking events and in attempts to explain marvellous features in our experience. The oldest myths deal with cosmic processes, with the birth and loves of the gods or with the benefits or evils they confer on mankind. Then there are the hero legends with their religious subvariety, the saints' legends, and the 'magus' stories which Jolles designates as anti-legends. The Märchen is an early well-developed form of epic narrative.

The term 'epic' is undefinable, but it is possible to determine its goal



and delimit its range. In essence it may be regarded as the mental conception and artistic representation in words of some stirring event in the light of its human significance and in the guise of an aesthetically effective narrative. The epic author selects, interprets and explains in his own way, but his general tendency is objective, he stands midway between the 'vita activa' and the 'vita contemplativa'.

In the chapter on structure the author discusses in turn the following topics: the rôle of the narrator; epic action (defined as that chain of events which occurs in time in the foreground of the narrative and appears primarily as a closed series of proximate impressions), motive (a relatively self-contained and independently significant combination of features showing the facts in a state of flux and susceptible of stirring our emotions); formulae (the higher unities into which motives group themselves); the march of the action in 'steps', 'stretches', 'laps' and 'turning-points' or 'peripeteias'; leitmotifs used for producing atmosphere and for architectural effect; and finally constructive motives of a retarding, retrospective or anticipatory character. After the author has shown how the Epic regards time and how the time-concept adopted finds expression in epic language, e.g., the use of tenses, and how epic space is contrasted with what we might call topographical space, he goes on to discuss epic characters or personages both heroic and secondary. This section is followed by a study of the epic use of milieu (nature, city life, provincial life, etc.) and of the supernatural world.

The general part of the work is concluded by a narrative survey of epic diction showing how all the stops of the organ can be utilised for different purposes and how, for instance, various metrical forms, e.g., the hexameter, the four-beat line, etc. are fitted to express the subject matter embodied in them.

In the second part, in treating the various classes of epic narration, the author carefully distinguishes from the 'long' forms the 'short' forms, e.g., short story (*Novelle*), heroic lay and ballad, anecdote, such off-shoots as robber and ghost stories, literary fairy tales, and fables. The 'long' would include the poetic epic from Homer onwards; travesty representing the distortion of the heroic into the grandiloquent, parody representing the application of the elevated tone of epic to trivial themes; the saga in its relation to the myth and to the family chronicle, and the fully-fledged novel (*Roman*) in its two main branches, the novel of development (*Entwicklungsroman*) and the novel of incident (*Ereignisroman*). The treatment is partly historical in regard to general development and partly conceptual, and many interesting side-lights are thrown upon the inter-crossing and mutual relationships of these variegated types.

The author's heart is, as might be expected in a German, with the novel of development and the saga. The index of authors, however, demonstrates the wide extent of his reading, which includes English, Scandinavian and French writers. It would be interesting to hear the author's views on the conception and technique of such recent novels as Jules Romains' *Les Hommes de Bonne Volonté*—one misses a reference to 'unanisme'—and of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* and *The Waves*.

The treatise is naturally intended in the first place for Germans, and underlines, though perhaps not unduly, the psychological significance of the German novel, whereas a foreign critic is tempted at times to feel that the much praised psychological 'Vertiefung' of the German novel is stressed at the expense of that ease of manner, that effortlessness indispensable to the most satisfying aesthetic experience.

The typography of the book is excellent, and misprints are few (p. 104 *hohem* for 'hohen', p. 187 *horror-stricken*). Altogether this is a book to be pondered over and treasured.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL

## SHORT NOTICES

In *The Claim of Our Mother Tongue* (*English Association Pamphlet*, 87. London: H. Milford. 1934. 12 pp. 2s.) the Hon. Edward Lyttelton makes an eloquent and much needed protest against the 'random falsification of the meaning of words which has the disastrous effect of impoverishing the language'. In this he will have the sympathy and support of all who have any feeling for the beauty of the English language and for its right use; it is the more to be regretted therefore that he should weaken his case by seeming, at times, to object even to that slow change which is inevitable in a living language. It is surely misleading to speak of the word *wonderful* as being 'in jeopardy' when the use of which he complains (p. 6) is found not only in Chaucer but in *Beowulf*. Or would Dr Lyttelton maintain that the strength of Chaucer's Squire and the gold hangings of Hrothgar's hall were more truly wonderful than a man of outstanding force of character and intellectual power?

H. W. H.

Written in the curious English that is cultivated by foreign students of our language (e.g. '*a mock garden: pre- and suffixes*'), Mr Ole Reuter's treatise *On the Development of English Verbs from Latin and French Past Participles* (Helsingfors: Akademiska Bokhandeln; Leipzig. Otto Harrassowitz. 1934. vi+172 pp. 53 mk.) is the work of an enthusiast, who has spared no pains to trace the history of verbs belonging to this category, the whole being apparently intended as a contribution to the psychology of language.

The material, which is very full, has been gleaned from the *N.E.D.*, supplemented by the author's own notes from texts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and if—as is frankly admitted—no new facts of first-rate importance are disclosed, the book has some suggestions about the derivation of these verbs, and here and there earlier examples of their occurrence are cited. In both these matters he joins issue with the editors of the *N.E.D.*, who, he complains, treat his past participles as though they were 'participial adjectives, or simple adjectives'. In the matter of earlier examples the author certainly scores several points, but his

claim to have antedated *surprise* by nearly a hundred years cannot be upheld in face of the evidence of the better MSS.

Nevertheless, on account of its lists, and as affording some useful details about these verbs, the work can be safely recommended

A. O. B.

An important Chaucerian dissertation reaches us from Hamburg University in *Vom Fabliau zu Boccaccio und Chaucer. Ein Vergleich zweier Fabliaux mit Boccaccios Decamerone IX. 6 u. mit Chaucers Reeves Tale*, by Marius Lange. (*Britannica*, Heft 8 Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter. 1934 7 M.) The author has made an entirely fresh study of the points of similarity and contrast in the two French fabliaux—*De Gombert et des deus Clers*, *Le Meunier et les dix clers*, Boccaccio's *Decameron*, Day 9, Tale 6, and Chaucer's *Reeve's Tale*, and is chiefly concerned with the artistic and stylistic side rather than the more mechanical points of similarity. The chapters dealing with humour, irony and satire are specially to be commended for their penetrating insight into the various writers' methods and poetical gifts, and for their revelation of the secret of Chaucer's superiority and uniqueness. The individuality of Chaucer's satirical genius is thrown into unusual relief by the detailed comparisons which the author makes. It may be argued by some that Lange's conception of Chaucer's humour as characteristically Germanic is in places somewhat overdrawn, though on the whole the outlook is unbiased. The other chapters might with advantage have been reduced slightly in number by a regrouping, but they are all full of interesting material and bring out the various poets' individuality as seen in such things as their feeling for nature, their attention to detail and manipulation of the material at their disposal. The study of the characterisation which occupies a lengthy chapter is ably done and should be valuable for purposes of reference as well as for its intrinsic worth. This detailed analysis, accompanied by adequate quotation and reference from each of the versions, is followed by a handy summary and criticism of the writers' methods and achievements. Other smaller chapters are closely linked with this one and deal with points of detail in workmanship. This dissertation has been done with great thoroughness and care, and is well documented throughout, though the author does not seem to have discovered Miss Dempster's work on the MSS. of *Le Meunier*.

J. P. O.

A useful contribution to the study of Richard Rolle's writings has been made in *Sprache und Stil der englischen Mystik des Mittelalters*, by A. Olmes (*Studien zur englischen Philologie*, LXXVI. Halle: Niemeyer. 1933. viii+100 pp. 4 M. 50). After a very concise but useful preliminary sketch of English mysticism and mystical writing of the period, including that of Julian of Norwich, the author gives us the results of a systematic investigation of the metaphor and symbolism of Rolle's work. Concerning this it need only be said that the author is sufficiently widely read to be able to bring out the special characteristics of Rolle's mystical

writings and his means of expression set against a wide background of useful parallels and analogies. The second part of this thesis deals with Rolle's prose style and is much more exhaustive in its treatment. Here we see the manner in which Rolle made use of alliteration, rhyme, antithesis, rhythm, repetition, etc., and special attention is paid to his individual peculiarities of style, while we are still given an indication of the stylistic mannerisms of mystical writers in general. The book is well documented and there is an excellent bibliography, and the work maintains the standard of thoroughness and freshness of treatment which we have learnt to expect from this series. J. P. O.

Partly because of Browning's wide if not deep study of Rabbinic literature there arose a legend of his having Jewish blood in his veins, a legend which, in spite of Furnivall's researches, has never completely vanished. The influence of mediæval Hebrew literature and legend, besides affecting his style and philosophy, has contributed to the difficulty of understanding several of his poems, and therefore there is some value in Dr J. B. Lieberman's attempt in *Robert Browning and Hebraism* (Jerusalem. 1934. 93 pp.) to trace back to their sources those poems of Browning which are based on Rabbinic writings.

'Follow the RUACH', cries one of his characters, and the quest led the poet himself into many strange places. Unlike Coleridge, however, who assimilated his literary references and associations so completely, Browning's influences lie nearer the surface, so that industry rather than intuition is required to follow them up. This is particularly the case when the study, as here, deals with the 'manifest' rather than the 'latent content' of his poetry, to use the fashionable jargon of the day.

Dr Lieberman has succeeded in identifying Ben Karshook with Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanos, her contention, however, that Jochanan Hakkadosh is a composite figure based on a fusion of three historic characters appears less likely. She has cleared up the puzzle of the Hebrew phrase quoted in the note to 'Jochanan Hakkadosh', and throws further light on the symbolic significance of the title 'Bells and Pomegranates'. Interesting parallels are given to prove Browning's firsthand acquaintance with Ibn Ezra's writings, though a knowledge of his commentaries seems more certain than of his poems. Berdoe quotes several further parallels which Dr Lieberman seems not to have noticed.

This study is marred by numerous misprints, mostly in the English, but occasionally in the Hebrew quotations as well, and the translations of the Hebrew are not always as close as they might be. Browning's debt to Hebraism is by no means exhausted in this thesis which really touches little more than the fringe of a large and interesting subject.

A. M.

The twenty-second volume of the 'Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte', *Cligés* (nach W. Foerstlers letzter Ausgabe in Auswahl bearbeitet und mit Glossar versehen von Hermann Breuer. Halle: Niemeyer. 1934. viii+79 pp. 2 M.), is a welcome addition to an admirable series of

Romance class-texts. It contains extracts from *Cligés*, amounting to about a third of the whole poem, linked up by summaries of the omitted portions. The choice of passages brings out the psychological and ethical interest of the romance, in particular the poet's ideal of love in marriage, set up in opposition to *Tristan*. The 'adventure' element has accordingly been reduced to a minimum, though a sample of the hero's prowess is retained in the account of his single-handed victory over the dozen knights who have abducted Fenice. There is no literary introduction or notes, as these are accessible in Foerster's editions.

The text is that of Foerster's third and fourth edition in the 'Romanische Bibliothek', including variants. The numbering of the lines is retained. There are a few unimportant deviations. In 3684 the reading *male ancontre* (adopted in Foerster's original edition) is preferred to the *mal ancontre* of the 'Romanische Bibliothek' edition. Numerous alterations have been made in Foerster's punctuation, with a consequent gain in clearness. In the short Glossary a useful feature is the reference for certain troublesome words to a note in Foerster's edition or to the *Chrétien Dictionary* in the 'Romanische Bibliothek'. Under *deboneire*, consistently printed by Professor Breuer as one word, it is somewhat surprising to be referred, not to the Dictionary, which supports this view, but to Foerster's note, which justifies the form *de bon' eire*. In rime-words containing tonic *e* or *o* the quality of the vowel is conveniently indicated by a diacritic sign. The Glossary does not claim to be exhaustive (*auner* might well have been added), but it is adequate. This excellent edition will be very useful in seminar work. C. I. W.

How remote is now Arcadia, and how omnipresent once it was! Dr Herta Wendel set about the tedious business of reading the Arcadian literature of the principal European languages, ancient and modern, and has printed a couple of her treatises in *Arkadien im Umkreis bukolischer Dichtung in der Antike und in der französischen Literatur* (Giessener Beiträge zur Romanischen Philologie, 26. Giessen: Rom. Sem. 1933. 123 pp. 4 M. 50), leaving in manuscript with the Giessen Faculty of Philosophy other sections treating of the Italian, Spanish, English and German Arcadias. The restriction is due to financial causes; the selection is perhaps based on the principle of the greatest good for the greater number. The direct association of French and Classical Arcadias leaves a good deal unexplained and the reader must apply the correctives that were doubtless given in the unpublished parts of this work. As to the ancients, Dr Wendel, taking Vergil for her point of departure, asks: 'Why Arcadia? Why not Sicily or Mantua?' She gives the available evidence for bucolic poetry in Arcadia (Polybius, Anyte of Tegea, etc.) before Theocritus, and holds that Vergil, though a pupil of the Sicilian, appeals over Theocritus's head to a more ancient and venerable inspiration. In Vergil Arcadia is still geographical and bucolic; in Calpurnius Siculus Italian gardens appear in the Arcadian wastes, and Pan is not the only deity; in Ausonius an ungeographical Arcadia blooms on the banks of the Moselle. The Italian humanists adapted this material to modern uses,

and devised new pastoral genres—the novel and drama. Dr Wendel resumes her studies with Clément Marot and Ronsard and accompanies the now beperiwigged shepherds down to André Chénier, and even to the Goncourt brothers.

W. J. E.

Professor G. Boas' most recent book (*The Happy Beast in French Thought of the Seventeenth Century* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford, 1933. vii+159 pp. 11s. 6d.) has a singular title, yet it would perhaps be hard to find another to describe adequately the subject with which it deals—the belief held by certain French thinkers from Montaigne onwards 'that the beasts—like savages—are more natural than man, and hence man's superiors'. Professor Boas briefly traces the growth of this notion from Montaigne onwards, and then, in greater detail, discusses its history and development throughout the seventeenth century. Montaigne, inspired, it would seem, by the paradoxical writings of Ortensio Landi and Giraldu, made 'the happy beast' a current idea in France. His followers, Charron, Pasquier, La Mothe le Vayer, and others, all upheld the superiority of animals over human beings. On the other hand the belief was violently attacked on religious or philosophical grounds by Garasse and Descartes, and later by Bossuet and Malebranche. The concluding chapter shows the use made of this form of 'infra-primitivism', as Professor Boas calls it, by the satirists and poets of seventeenth-century France. The author is skilful in keeping clearly apart two points of view, which were apt to become confused, namely the idea that because the beasts cannot reason, they are nearer nature, and more capable of happiness than man; and the idea that animals are as rational as human beings, if not more so, and that therefore they can come just as near happiness. Descartes' theory of the 'animal-machine' is carefully studied, and full justice is done to Bossuet's treatment of the subject.

K. T. B.

'Opéra-Comique en Vaudevilles' is the name given by Mr F. J. Carmody (*Le Répertoire de l'Opéra-Comique en Vaudevilles de 1708 à 1764. University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, 1933, vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 373-438. University of California and Cambridge University Presses) to the type of musical comedy or farce, of which the words were sung to popular tunes or vaudevilles, only a small portion, if any, consisting of 'ariettes' specially written for the occasion, or of spoken verse or prose. It often took the form of a parody of a serious play. The genre enjoyed considerable if not steady popularity during the earlier half of the eighteenth century, from its disintegration in the 'sixties resulted the prose Vaudeville and the Opéra Comique in the modern sense of the term. Mr Carmody's list of authors and plays, the result of patient and careful investigation, is preceded by an interesting and admirably lucid introduction, and should prove a useful instrument of research to students of dramatic art in eighteenth-century France.

H. B.

The three writers discussed in the final volume of M. Trahard's *Les Maîtres de la Sensibilité française au XVIIIe Siècle* (Tome iv. Paris: Boivin. 1933. 357 pp. 30 fr.) scarcely seem to be sufficiently *maîtres* or sufficiently *sensibles* to warrant such an honourable place in the series. The earlier volumes were dominated by Prévost, Diderot and Rousseau, of the three authors treated in the fourth volume, only Bernardin de Saint-Pierre has any claim to have exercised an influence on the sensibility of his contemporaries and successors. Choderlos de Laclos is included on two grounds—one, that the characters of his *Liaisons Dangereuses* pay due tributes of tears and swoons to the current vogue for sensibility, the other that the private correspondence of Laclos reveals a humanity which belies the cynicism of his novel. Retif de la Bretonne's acute physical sensibility, with its accompaniment of panic fears, emotional outbursts and periodic loss of consciousness, early found an outlet in the exasperated erotism which pervades his writings. M. Trahard points out, however, another aspect of his sensibility, the sincere and deep emotion roused in Retif by the natural beauties of his native Basse-Bourgogne. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre is shown to be the opposite of Laclos—*sensible*, even sentimental in his writings, hard, often callous and selfish in his human contacts.

M. Trahard tends, perhaps, to put overmuch faith in psychoanalysis as a means of understanding literary phenomena, while he is intolerant of medical analysis of these same phenomena. In his Conclusion he replies to some of his critics, and there is an interesting paragraph on over-analytic sensibility, '*narcissisme*', leading up to the *mal du siècle*.

It is a pity that minor inaccuracies still mar M. Trahard's work. He is hardly to be blamed for confusing one of the many Roses in Retif's *Calendrier* with the Rose Pombelins whom his father had wanted to marry (pp. 150, 169), but it is more serious that the pariah of Bernardin's *Chaumière indienne* should be made responsible for the words of the English doctor (pp. 102-3), and that he should be made to say 'La conscience vaut mieux que la science', instead of 'La conscience rassure mieux que la science', which is a very different thing.

M. E. I. R.

*The Relationship of the Spanish Libro de Alexandre to the Alexandreis of Gautier de Châtillon*, by Raymond S. Willis, Jr. (Elliott Monographs No. 31. Princeton and Oxford University Presses. 1934. 94 pp. 5s.), is a footnote to Morel-Fatio, who in 1875 demonstrated the close dependence of the Spanish on the Latin poem. In 1906, on the basis of a newly discovered MS., Morel-Fatio saw grounds for conceding somewhat more of merit and originality to the Spaniard, and promised a revised edition of his *Recherches* on sources, composition and language. This promise he did not live to fulfil, and Mr Willis now takes up one-third of the project, a meticulous collation of the two poems and an enquiry into the principles or absence of principles of the Spaniard in handling or departing from *Alexandreis* material. Mr Willis's approach is by statistics and the catalogue, methods whose application to literary questions becomes more and

more formidable. There are classified lists of settings, of characters named once, forgotten once, retained anonymously, of place-names, of passages of direct discourse, narrative, description, of Christian and pagan elements. By this path criticism must soon we fear attain to unreadability, which imposes, it is true, its own authority. The conclusions drawn in the present study are briefly that the author of the *Alexandre* christianised and mediævalised the classical story, which Morel-Fatio had already noted, that his departure from the literal in passages corresponding to the Latin is due to the exigencies of a different metre, which is of a prime obviousness, and that he controlled the *Alexandreus* more or less consciously by reference to the whole body of Alexander material—a meagre result perhaps for a deal of honest labour.

W. C. A.

We are indebted to Mr Wesley R. Long for a very competent edition of Hayton's *Flor de las ystorias de Orient* from the unique Escorial manuscript Z-I-2 (Chicago: University Press, London: Cambridge University Press, 1934 viii+223 pp. 13s. 6d.). The French original of this fourteenth-century Aragonese translation was compiled from memory by the Armenian monk, Haytonus, at the request of Pope Clement V, and dictated to Nicolas Falcon at Poitiers in the year 1307. It is an account of the Tartars, principally in their relations with the Armenians, for whom their friendship was not without uncertainty and excitement. The last book, which is written in a frankly propagandist spirit for crusaders, devises a new plan of campaign for the recovery of the Holy Land, using the military power of the Tartars, but without too close a *rapprochement* to such dangerous allies. The Aragonese version, which Mr Long has carefully edited, with variants from the French and Latin manuscripts, was made for Johan Ferrandez de Heredia. Its language shows a more pronounced Catalan tinge than that of most of the works in the Heredia group, and is not unlike the language of the *Libro de Marco Polo*, which is in the same Escorial codex as the *Flor de las ystorias*. Catalanisms such as *mug iorn*, *matex*, *comiat*, and *aconssigun* (3rd sing. pret.), if they are not due to the scribe, point to a Catalan translation as an intermediate between the Aragonese and the French original, a possibility that Mr Long carefully considers in his introduction. Apart from the question of filiation, the language of the text provides abundant material for the study of Aragonese in its earliest literary form, and of the relationship of this dialect to French and to Provençal-Catalan. We only regret that limitations of space have compelled the editor to hold over a large part of his linguistic material.

J. W. R.

Miss Eunice Joiner Gates' *The Metaphors of Llus de Góngora* (Philadelphia. 1933. *University of Pennsylvania Series in Romance Languages and Literatures*, No. 25. 260 pp.) is noteworthy for real insight into the subject. Apart from a conventional introduction and conclusion, it is divided into four sections of varying length and value. An historical survey, 'Literary patterns followed by Góngora', is followed by their 'Chronological Development', after which comes the central portion of



the study, 'The Range and Characteristics of Góngora's Metaphors', closed by a survey of the attitude of Góngora's contemporaries.

The book does useful service in the first of these sections by stressing the fact that Góngora was not a sudden innovator. The object of Section iv (the third of the chapters just named), is to classify Góngora's metaphors, their characteristics being tabulated as follows: sustained metaphor, parallelism and antithesis, word-play, intensification, amplification, relation between Subject and Object (a short and obscure passage) and beauty. No claim is made to have exhausted the possibilities of this topic, perhaps a complete index of Góngora's metaphors is hardly to be wished for, but a more complete tabulation on the lines of this study would have been welcome. The development and nature of metaphor in a poet like Góngora would provide an admirable instrument for the understanding and enjoyment of his work, as valuable in a new way as the syntactical elucidations of Sr Alonso, and the study of the plastic elements in Pabst. An example is the matter of Góngora's frequent repetition of metaphors which is touched upon on p. 115. The development or adaptation (for it does not follow that a later use is an improvement on an earlier) to different circumstances of a metaphor, the particular elements that reappear (an index to Góngora's psychological nature, on which Dr Gates has some acute remarks to make at times, e.g., p. 126), are worth studying in full, both because a difficult metaphor seen in several contexts becomes clear, and reassumes the investiture of beauty it had in Góngora's own mind, and because this poetical economics clarifies for us the whole nature of Góngora's art, the repetition of metaphor to be found in it is not a sign of a threadbare inspiration, but rather of enrichment of poetic composition. A certain lack of emphasis is felt in this book upon the fact that, as the writer herself (p. 90) says, '... he sees in everything a kinship to his subject', in other words the strong conceptist element to be found in Góngora. This it would seem essential to perceive in a study of the construction of Góngora's poetry. Dr Gates has suggested a very interesting line of study which, if she would pursue it in greater detail, would place us very much in her debt.

E. S.

With three recently published volumes—*Bibliografía de la Poesía Mexicana*, by Arturo Torres-Ríoeco and Ralph E. Warner (xxxix + 86 pp.); *A Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of Ecuador*, by Guillermo Rivera (ix + 76 pp.); *A Tentative Bibliography of Colombian Literature*, by Sturgis E. Leavitt and Carlos García-Prada (xi + 80 pp.) (all three: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford, 1934)—the series 'Bibliographies of Spanish-American Literature' of the Harvard Council of Hispano-American Studies approaches the close of the task set itself by the Council. It is to be congratulated on undertaking such a useful and necessary piece of work. In fact, the word 'tentative' in the Colombian bibliography seems almost an excess of caution. No doubt there are omissions, but such a little-known book as Pérez Triana's *Cuentos a Sonny* is listed in both its original English and its Spanish translation, while Alfredo Gómez Jaime's unimportant *Impresiones rápidas*, which is

simply a note-book of the South American's inevitable European tour, is also included, along with other and more important works of the same author. (The place and date of this small octavo by the way are: Bogotá, Hernando Santos, 1905.) The Ecuadorian volume gives measurements of volumes, but for the most part omits the useful authors' dates of the Colombian volume. This applies in some degree to the Mexican bibliography, which is preceded by an interesting study of Mexican poetry with attractive quotations.

E. S.

In his examination of the language of the Heidelberg manuscript of Gottfried's *Tristan* (*Die Sprache der Heidelberger Handschrift von Gottfried von Strassburgs Tristan* Ohlau: Hermann Eschenhagen 1934) Dr F. P. Pickering has written a little book of twofold interest. The subject has been thoroughly examined for the first time—Professor Marold did not deal with the matter in detail in his edition of *Tristan*—and the method has not been used before in dealing with a Middle High German classic.

Dr Pickering compares the language of his manuscript with that of various documents of German chancelleries of the same period. From this comparison he draws his conclusions. He uses this new method with caution, and points out the dangers that may exist in its use. His treatise is a fine example of exact scholarship combined with critical acumen.

A. C. D.

*Die elsassische Lyrik des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts in ihrer Abhängigkeit von den literarischen Strömungen in Deutschland* by Karl Poschel (*Schriften des Wissenschaftlichen Instituts der Elsass-Lothringer im Reich an der Universität Frankfurt*, 6. 1932. 152 pp. 3 M. 75) shows untiring energy and remarkable objectivity. The poetry of Alsace to-day, as represented by Lienhard, Schickele, Flake, Reinacher and others, seems once more to betray some signs of its mighty German inheritance from Otfried, Gottfried von Strassburg, Brant, Murner, Fischart, Moscherosch, Spener, Pfeffer, but in the nineteenth century it produced no more than the mediocre talent of a Spach, the brothers Stober, Candidus, Zetter and Muhl. The author dedicates the first part of his book to a discreet discussion of historical and linguistic problems, the influence of a bourgeois milieu and racial character. He traces relationships between Alsatian poetry and German literature in such movements as the Anacreontic, Classicism, Romanticism and Jungdeutschland, which, however, failed to awaken the Alsations' sympathy. Their hero was Schiller, whose dramas Th. Braun translated into French. The second part of the book contains systematic inspection of sources (calendars, journals, biographies, poems, etc.). The author does not fall prey to haphazard conjectures, and only one or two misprints (e.g., p. 73, 'bud' for 'but') mar this valuable contribution to the history of German poetry.

A. C.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS

October—December 1934

With the collaboration of Dr MARY S. SERJEANTSON (English),  
Dr A. GILLIES and Dr F. P. PICKERING (German).

### GENERAL.

- BERNOVILLE, G., *Les Jésuites* Paris, Grasset. 15 fr.  
 BUHLER, K., *Sprachtheorie Die Darstellungsfunktion d Sprache* Jena, Fischer. 20 M  
*Enciclopedia Italiana*, XXII: MALE-MESSIO Rome, Treccani  
 FRANCKE, E., *Gestalten der Tierdichtung*. Bonn, Schönershoven  
 GROSSMANN, R. und G. ANTZE, *Verhandlungen des 24 internationalen Amerikan-  
 1sten Kongresses (Hamburg, 1930)*. Hamburg, Friederichsen 30 M  
 GROUSSET, R., *Histoire des Croisades et du Royaume franc de Jérusalem*, I. Paris,  
 Plon. 60 fr.  
*Katholische Leistung in der Weltliteratur der Gegenwart* Freiburg, Herder  
 7 M. 20.  
 KINDERMANN, H. (editor), *Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte*. Potsdam, Athenaion.  
 (To be completed in 85 parts at 2 M 80 per part )  
 MACARTNEY, C. A., *Hungary (Modern World Series)*. London, Benn. 21s  
 MEOZZI, A., *Il Petrarchismo europeo, sec XVI* Pisa, Vallermi L. 25  
 NIELSEN, K., *Lappisk Ordbok*, II. G-M (Publ Inst Oslo). Paris, Belles Lettres.  
 200 fr.  
 OLSEN, ØBJAN, *La Conquête de la Terre*, III [Columbus to Magellan] Paris,  
 Payot. 20 fr.  
 SARAN, F., *Zur Metrik des epischen Verses der Serben* (Veroff. d. Slav Inst.,  
 Berlin, 10). Leipzig, Harrassowitz 3 M.  
 SCACOCIA-SCARAFONI, C. e H. DAVOLI, *Notazione bibliografica degli incunabuli  
 conservati nella Biblioteca Comunale di Viterbo*. Reggio Emilia, Scuola  
 di Bibliografia Italiana.  
 SMITH, PRESERVED, *A History of modern Culture*, II: *The Enlightenment*,  
 1687-1776. London, Routledge 12s. 6d.  
 STRUVE, G., *Literature in Soviet Russia*. London, Routledge. 8s. 6d.  
 SVANSTROM, R. and C. F. PALMSTIERNA, *A Short History of Sweden*, trsl Joan  
 Bulman. Oxford, Univ Press. 12s. 6d.  
 WEILL, G., *Le Journal. Origines, évolution et rôle de la Presse périodique  
 (Évolution de l'Humanité)*. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 40 fr.  
 WULF, *Hommage à M. le Prof. Maurice de Wulf* (extr. Rev. Néoscolastique, 36).  
 14s.  
 ZALESKI, Z. L., *Attitudes et destinées. Faces et profils d'écrivains polonais*.  
 Paris, Belles Lettres. 25 fr.

### ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- KEUCK, K., *Historia; Geschichte d. Wortes u.s. Bedeutungen in d. Antike u. in  
 d. roman. Sprachen* (Diss. Münster, 1931) Emsdetten, Leuchte.  
 MEYER-LUBEK, W., *Die Schicksal des lateinischen L im Romanischen* (Saxon  
 Academy, Phil.-Hist., 86). Leipzig, Hirzel. 3 M. 20.  
 MEYER-LUBEK, W., *Roman. etymol. Wörterbuch*, Lfg. 17. Heidelberg, Winter.  
 2 M. 50.

## Mediaeval Latin.

- ADELARDUS BATHONIENSIS, *Quaestiones naturales*, ed. M. Muller (Beitr. z. Geschichte d. Phil. d. M.A., 31) Munster, Aschendorff. 4 M. 40.
- ANSELMUS, *Cur Deus Homo*, ed. F. S. Schmitt Bonn. 2 M. 80.
- ECKARDI, *Opera Latina*, I *Super Oratione Dominica*, ed. R. Klibansky (auspiciis Instituti Sanctae Sabinae edita). Leipzig, Meiner. (To be issued in 15 fascicules at total cost of about 80 M)
- MABILLON, *Acta Sanctorum* (re-issue). 11 vols. Macon, Protat. 550 fr.
- RIGOBON, MARCELLA, *Il Teatro e la latinità di Hrotsvitha* (Univ. Padua, Publ. Fac. Letters, 2). Padua, C.E.D.A.M.
- VAUX, R. DE, *Notes et textes sur l'Avicennisme latin aux confins des XII<sup>e</sup> et XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Bibl. Thomiste, 20). Paris, Vrin. 20 fr.

## Italian.

- ALFIERI, Virginia, ed. G. Gonfiglioli. Milan, Vallardi. L. 2.75.
- ANIANTE, Gabriel d'Annunzio, *Saint Jean du Fascisme*. Paris, Mercure de France. 12 fr.
- ANTONA-TRAVERSI, C., *Curiosità dannunziane inedite e rare*, I. Rome, Casa del Libro. L. 10.
- ANTONA-TRAVERSI, C., *D'Annunzio nella vita e nelle opere: documenti inediti e rari*, I. Rome, Casa del Libro. L. 12.
- ATENE, P., *Religione e misticismo in Antonio Fogazzaro*. Turin, Paravia. L. 10.
- BALDINI, M., *La Genesi del Saul di V. Alfieri*. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 12.
- BASSI, O., *Tra Classicismo e Romanticismo*. Ippolito Pindemonte. Milan, Dante Alighieri. L. 15.
- BENOIST, C., *Le Machiavélisme*, II: *Le Machiavel*. Paris, Plon. 15 fr.
- BENTIVOGLIO, G., *Memorie e lettere*, ed. C. Panigada (Scrittori d'Italia). Bari, Laterza. L. 35.
- BERNI, F., *Poesie e prose*, ed. E. Chiòrboli (Bibl. dell' Arch. Rom., I, 20) Geneva, Olschki 30 Sw. fr.
- BOSCARINI, V., *Gli Scrittori de L' Eronca*. Perugia, Tip. Grafica. L. 8.
- CAMPANA, M., *La Musicalità della lingua italiana*. Rome, Augustea. L. 5.
- CARRARA, E., *La Leggenda di Laura*. Turin, L' Erma. L. 5.
- CIASCA, R., *Bibliografia sarda, v: Appendice e indici* (Studi Meridionali). Rome, Collezione Meridionale. L. 30.
- CORSANO, A., *Umanesimo e religione in G. B. Vico* (Bibl. di Cultura moderna). 5s. 6d.
- COSSAR, R. M., *Usanze, riti e superstizioni del popolo di Montona nell' Istria*. Catania, Prampolini. L. 6.
- DANTE, *La Divina Commedia*, ed. N. Zingarelli. Bergamo, Arti Grafiche. L. 300.
- DANTE, *La Divina Commedia*, I: *Inferno*, comm. C. Grabher. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 10.
- DANTE'S *Divine Comedy*, I. *Hell*, trans. by L. How. New York, Harbor Press. \$ 2.50.
- Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch*, XVI. Weimar, Bohlau. 14 M.
- DI GIOVANNI, A., *La Vita e l' opera di Giovanni Meli*. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 15.
- DRESLER, A., *Geschichte der italienische Presse*, III: 1900-1935. Munich, Oldenbourg. 8 M. 50.
- FARINELLI, A., *Francesco De Sanctis*. Rome, Academy. L. 5.
- FATTOVICH, N., *Seppelliamo l' Arcadia*. Rome, Signorelli. L. 6.

- FOBERTI, F, Gioacchino da Fiore. Florence, Sansoni. L. 18.
- FORESTIERI, R, Loredana e la narrativa novecentesca in Italia. Bologna, Gallari. L. 12.
- FUBINI, M., Studi sulla critica letteraria del Settecento. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 8.
- FUSCO, MARIA, L'Opera di Giovanni Verga. Catania, Studio Edit. Moderno. L. 10.
- GIUSTI, G., Epistolario. Florence, Salani. L. 5.
- GIUSTI, G., Poesie, lettere e scritti, annot. A. Avancini. Milan, Vallardi. L. 7.
- GRANELLA, C, Angiolo Silvio Novaro. Palermo, La Tradizione. L. 4.
- LADWIG, P., Dantes Vita Nuova bei Goethe. Darmstadt, Ernst Ludwig-Pressen. 2 M.
- LA MANTIA, G., L'Ordinamento interno del Regno di Sicilia sotto gli Aragonesi, 1282-1409. Palermo, Boccone del Povero.
- LEOPARDI, Epistolario, ed. F. Moroncini, I. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 25.
- LOMBARDI-SATRIANI, R., Consuetudini giuridiche calabresi: Usi matrimoniali. Catania, Prampolini. L. 6.
- MANZONI, I Promessi Sposi, crit. ed. Milan, Tip. Gregoriana. L. 40.
- MARINO, MARIA T., La 'quaedam profetia'. Palermo, Boccone del Povero. L. 10.
- METASTASIO, Opere scelte, ed. G. Natali. Milan, Vallardi. L. 15.
- PASQUALI, S. P., Varianti lunigianesi dei 'vocaboli'. Catania, Prampolini. L. 6.
- ROEDEL, R., Note manzoniane. Turin, Chiantore. L. 18.
- ROEDER, R., The Man of the Renaissance (Savonarola, Machiavelli, Castiglione, Aretino). London, Routledge. 15s.
- ROMAGNOLI, E., Discorsi critici. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 12.
- ROMANO, P., Pasquino nel Settecento. Rome, Tip. Augustiniana. L. 10.
- SASSI, R., Di Agostino Angelelli, umanista fabrianese. Fabriano, Gentile.
- SCARPA, A., L'Estetica di Alessandro Manzoni. Venice, Lib. Emiliana. L. 10.
- SONNE, I., Intorno alla vita di Leone Ebreo. Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 6.
- TAMARIS, Ugo Ojetti, romanziere e novellista. Palermo, Lao. L. 3.
- TROCHI, B., Maestri e amici (Deledda, etc.). Pescara, Tempo Nostro. L. 15.
- VARADY, E., La Letteratura italiana e la sua influenza in Ungheria. 2 vols. Rome, Istituto per l'Europa Orientale. L. 50.
- ZOTTOLI, A., Dal Bojardo all'Ariosto. Lanciano, Carabba. L. 12.

### Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- BÉCQUER, Obras completas, ed. Gascó Contell. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 25 ptas.
- BERGMANN, H., Madame d'Aulnoy und Spanien. Diss. Würzburg, Mayr, 1934.
- Boletín de Bibliotecas y Bibliografía, I, 1, 1934. Madrid, Seminario de Biblioteconomía de la Universidad. Per year 15 ptas.
- BOSCH-GIMPERA, P., Relations entre l'Irlande et l'Ouest de la Péninsule ibérique. Paris, Leroux. 70 fr.
- CERVANTES, Don Quijote, sel. ed. T. Heinemann (Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte, 25). Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 80.
- DOYLE, H. G., A Tentative Bibliography of the Belles-Lettres of Panama. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses.
- GIACALONE, B., Gli Aztechi. Genoa, Bozzi. L. 4.
- GHARDINI, C., Don Carlos (Bibl. Historique). Paris, Payot, 18 fr.
- GÓNGORA, Soledades, German transl. H. Brunn. Munich, Hueber. 5 M.

- GOODE, Sister TERESA CLARE, Gonzalo de Berceo: *El Sacrificio de la Misa*; a study of its symbolism and of its sources. Washington, Catholic University.
- HAMILTON, E. J., American treasure and the price revolution in Spain, 1501-1650 (*Economic Studies*, 43). Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.
- LEVI, E., *Vite romantiche* (Rivas, Martínez de la Rosa, Salamanca) Naples, Ricciardi. L. 8.
- LEHMANDE, P., Dictionnaire Basque-Français et Français-Basque, VI: KARO-MARA. Paris, Beauchesne. 20 fr.
- MADARIAGA, S., Don Quixote. an introductory essay in psychology. Newtown (Montgomery), Greyniog Press. 42s
- MERRIMAN, R. B., The Rise of the Spanish Empire, IV: Philip the Prudent. New York, Macmillan.
- MERTON, R., Cardinal Ximenes. London, Routledge. 12s. 6d.
- PIÑEYRO, E. and E. A. PEERS, The Romantics of Spain. Liverpool, Institute of Spanish Studies. 10s 6d
- PUYOL, J., La Conspiración de Espoz y Mina, 1824-30. Madrid, Archivos.
- RAPHAEL, M. I. and J. D. M. FORD, A Tentative Bibliography of Paraguayan Literature. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses
- RUBIO, D., Classical Scholarship in Spain. Washington, Mimeoform Press.
- RUIZ, The Book of Good Love, trsl. E. K. Kane. New York, Rudge.
- SHEMUEL HA-NAGHID, Diwan, ed. D. S. Sassoon. Oxford, Univ. Press. 15s.
- THOMPSON, J. E., La Civilisation aztèque, Fr. trsl. Eva Métraux (*Bibl. Historique*). Paris, Payot. 20 fr.
- TIMONEDA, The *Auto del Castillo de Emarus* and the *Auto de la Iglesia* of Juan Timoneda, ed. and trsl. Mildred F. Johnson (*Univ. Iowa Studies*, 4).
- VAN DER ESSEN, Alexandre Farnèse, 1545-1592. 3 vols. Paris, Éditions d'Art et d'Histoire. 200 fr.
- Vida de Estebanillo González (*Clásicos Castellanos*, 108-109). 2 vols. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 12 ptas.

#### Portuguese.

- PROVIDENCIA DA COSTA, J., Der Beitrag der portugiesischen Nation zur Weltliteratur. Berlin, Speyer und Peters. 1 M.
- TRINDADE COELHO, H. e G. BATTELLI, Documentos para o estudo das relações culturais entre Portugal e Itália, II. Florence, Alfani e Venturi.

#### Rumanian, Rhaetoromance.

- HANEȘ, P., Histoire de la littérature roumaine, pref. M. Roques. Paris, Leroux. 15 fr.
- IORGA, N., My American Lectures. Bucharest, State Printing Office.
- ROQUES, M., La Poésie roumaine contemporaine (*Taylorian Lecture*). Oxford, Univ. Press. 2s.
- STANCOU, Z., Antologia poezilor tineri. Bucharest, Fundația 'Regele Carol II'.

#### French, Provençal.

(Place of publication is Paris, unless otherwise stated.)

##### (a) General (including Linguistic).

- BRUNOT, F., Histoire de la langue française, VIII, 1: Le français dans les divers pays d'Europe. Colin. 120 fr.
- DAMAS, P., La Prononciation 'française' du latin depuis le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle (*Coll. Études Latines*). Belles Lettres. 8 fr.

- DAMOURETTE et PICHON, Des Mots à la Pensee, iv. D'Artrey. 125 fr.  
 Dictionnaire de l'Académie française, vi: PHR-REV Hachette. 40 fr.  
 DOUMIC, R., Histoire de la littérature française, revue. Mellottée 20 fr.  
 FALK, P., *Jusque* et autres termes en ancien français et en ancien provençal marquent le point d'arrivée, thèse (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift) 7s 6d.  
 HEINERMANN, T., Grundlagen der phonetischen Hervorhebung (Betonung) des Französischen Bielefeld, Velhagen und Klasing. 1 M 60.  
 KERNEY, E., A Glossary of French Medical Terms referable to the Eye. New York, Inst. Fr. Studies.  
 KRUSE, H., Sach- und Wortkundliches aus den sudfranzösischen Alpen (Verdon-, Vaire- und Vartal) (Studien z. VKR, 18). Hamburg, Seminar f. roman. Spr. u. Kultur 4 M  
 LOFFEL, K., Beiträge zur Geschichte von *montjoie*. Diss. Tübingen, Gobel.  
 MARTIAL, R., La Race française Mercure de France 24 fr.  
 PERROT, E., Les Institutions publiques et privées de l'ancienne France jusqu'en 1789. Sirey. 25 fr.  
 PLATE, R., Zur historischen und psychologischen Vertiefung der französischen Schulsyntax. Munich, Hueber. 2 M 50.  
 TOHEMERZINE, A., Bibliographie d'Éditions originales et rares d'auteurs français des XV<sup>e</sup>, XVI<sup>e</sup>, XVII<sup>e</sup> et XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles. 10 vols. 1927-1934. Plée. 400 fr.  
 WARTBURG, W. von, Französisch. etymol. Wörterbuch, Lfg. 28: FUNDUS-FYR und REGISTER. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 M  
 WEBER, HILDBURG, Die Personennamen in Rodez (Aveyron) um die Mitte des 14. Jh. (Berliner Beiträge z. roman. Phil., iv, 3). Jena, Gronau. 5 M. 50.

(b) *Old French.*

- CHRESTIEN. Kristian von Troyes, Erec und Enide, ed. W. Foerster. 3. ed. (Roman. Bibl., 13.) Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.  
 CORYN, M. S., Bertrand du Guesclin, 1320-80 (Bibl. Historique). Payot. 20 fr.  
 FOHE Tristan de Berne, La, ed. E. Hoepffner (Publ. Univ. Strasbourg). Belles Lettres. 15 fr.  
 GESSLER, J., Le Drame liturgique de Munsterbilsen. New York, Inst. French Studies \$0.50.  
 PASSION d'Autun, La, ed. Grace Frank. Soc. anc. textes fran.  
 VERCEL, R., Bertrand of Brittany. London, Routledge. 10s. 6d.  
 VILLON, Oeuvres, ed. Jeanroy. Paris, Horizons de France. 35 fr.

(c) *Modern French.*

- ARCARI, P., Balzac. Brescia, Morcelliana. L. 8.  
 AURENCHÉ, L., Jean-Jacques Rousseau chez Monsieur de Mably, à Lyon. Malfère. 15 fr.  
 BALZAC, César Birotteau, suivi de la Maison Nucingen (Génie de la France). NRF. 10 fr.  
 BARRÈS, M., Mes Cahiers, viii: 1909-11 (Coll. La Palatine). Plon. 25 fr.  
 BEALL, C. B., Chateaubriand et Le Tasse. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. 6s.  
 BAUMARCHAIS, Le Barbier de Séville et Le Mariage de Figaro. 3 vols. Larousse. 3 fr.  
 BAUMARCHAIS, Théâtre complet, ed. Allem. 1 vol. NRF. 45 fr.  
 BIERHOFF, E., Das Verhältnis zwischen 'hérédité', 'milieu' und 'moment' in Zolas Romanen. Diss. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.

- BOENIGER, Y., *Lamartine et le sentiment de la Nature*, pref. Strowski. Nizet et Bastard. 35 fr.
- BOILEAU, *Satires*, ed. Boudhors. Belles Lettres 27 fr.
- BOILEAU, *Satires*, ed. Griveaud. Delagrave. 5 fr.
- BORREL, E., *L'Interprétation de la Musique française de Lully à la Révolution*. Alcan. 15 fr.
- BOSSUET, *Lettres*, ed. Massis (Les Beaux Textes illustrés). 20 fr.
- BRETTON, A., *Qu'est-ce que le surrealisme?* Brussels, Henriquez 1 belga 50.
- CLARK, C. U., *Voyageurs, robes noires et coureurs de bois*. New York, Inst. French Studies \$2 75.
- CORNEILLE, *Théâtre complet* 2 vols. NRF. 120 fr.
- CORRÈGE, H. BÉDARIDA, *Théophile Gautier, poète et critique d'art, en face du C... Leroux* 7 fr.—Y. BEZARD, *Le Président des Brosses et le C. Leroux*. 4 fr.—H. JACOBET, *Un philosophe aux jardins d'Alcine: Hippolyte Taine et le C. Leroux* 4 fr.—P. JOURDA, *L'Émotion stendhalienne et le C. Leroux*. 4 fr.—R. MICHÉA, *Cochin devant le C. de Parme et le renouvellement du goût*. Leroux. 7 fr.
- DOENHARDT, W., *Lessing und Corneille*. Diss. Munster, Helios.
- DORMOY, MARIE, *La vraie Marion de Lorme*. Malfère. 15 fr.
- DOUTREPONT, G., *Jean Lemaire de Belges et la Renaissance* Brussels.
- DUBOS, *Approximations*. 6<sup>e</sup> série. Corrèa. 30 fr.
- ETCHEVERRY, A., *L'Idéalisme français contemporain* (Bibl. de Phil. contemp.). Alcan 35 fr.
- FAGUET, E., *Histoire de la Poésie française de la Renaissance au Romantisme*, VII: Voltaire. Boivin. 15 fr.
- FÉNELON, *Lettre à l'Académie*. 2 vols. Larousse. 1 fr. 50.
- FETTWEIS, C., *Apollinaire en Ardenne*. Brussels, Henriquez. 3 belgas.
- FREDERICH, EMMY, *Baskenland und Basken bei Pierre Loti* Diss. Wurzburg, Mayr.
- FUNCK-BRENTANO, *La Société sous l'ancien régime*. Flammarion. 3 fr. 75.
- GALTIER-BOISSIÈRE, J., et R. LEFÈVRE, *Histoire de la Presse*, II. Crapouillet. 12 fr.
- GESSLER, J., *Fragments d'anciens traités pour l'enseignement du français en Angleterre*. New York, Inst. French Studies. \$0.50.
- GILLOT, H., *Figures romantiques* Courville. 18 fr.
- GILLOT, H., *La Pensée de Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. Courville. 10 fr.
- HEIST, W., *Zur Geschichte des autobiographischen Arbeiterromans neuester Zeit in Frankreich*. Diss. Frankfurt
- JANSSEN, H., *Montaigne fidéiste* Nizet et Bastard. 50 fr.
- KNEER, G., *Das Familienproblem in Émile Zolas Rougon-Macquart*. Diss. Werthem, Bechstein.
- KNOWLES, DOROTHY, *La Réaction idéaliste au théâtre depuis 1890*. Droz. 60 fr.
- LA BRUYÈRE, *Oeuvres complètes* 1 vol. NRF. 45 fr.
- LAMARTINE, *Harmonies*. Larousse. 1 fr. 50.
- LA ROCHEFOUCAULD, *Oeuvres complètes* 1 vol. NRF. 45 fr.
- LEFÈVRE, R., *La Vie inquiète de Pierre Loti*. Malfère. 15 fr.
- LEFRANC, A., *Calvin et l'éloquence française*. Fischbacher. 7 fr. 50.
- LEHRISSON, F., *Madame Lafarge, écrivaine romantique*. Delmas. 12 fr.
- L'HERMITTE, *Le Parasite*, ed. J. Madeleine (STFM). Droz. 20 fr.
- LOT, F., *Alfred Jarry (Les Célébrités contemporaines)*. NRC. 9 fr.



- MARIVAUX, *Le Jeu de l'Amour et du Hasard* Larousse. 1 fr. 50.  
 MARTINO, P., *Stendhal* (revised edition). Boivin. 30 fr.  
 MASSIS, H., *Débats*. Plon. 12 fr.  
 MAURRAS, C., *Dictionnaire politique et critique*, établi par les soins de Pierre Chardon. 5 vols. Fayard. 50 fr.  
 MAX, H., *Die Satire in der französischen Publizistik unter bes. Berücks. des franz. Witzblattes*. Diss. Munich, Hofling.  
 MÉRIMÉE, *Lettres à Ludovic Vitet*, ed. M. Parturier. 15 fr.  
 MÉRIMÉE, *Romans, Contes et Nouvelles*. 1 vol. NRF. 52 fr.  
 MOLIERE, *L'Avare*, ed. L. Rolland (Classiques Delagrave). Delagrave. 5 fr.  
 MOLIERE, *Le Tartuffe* (Facsimile). Éditions des Bibl. Nat. de France. 100 fr.  
 RACINE, *Théâtre*, ed. D. Mornet (Les Grands Auteurs français). Mellottée. 25 fr.  
 REGNARD, *Les Joueurs*. Larousse. 1 fr. 50.  
 ROMAIN, C., *Louis XIII*. Hachette. 15 fr.  
 RONSARD, *Le Bocage de 1554* (Oeuvres complètes, vi) (STFM.). Droz. 10 fr.  
 RONSARD, *Les Odes de 1555* (Oeuvres complètes, vii) (STFM.). Droz. 40 fr.  
 SCHMIDT, MARGRIT, *Formen der Angst bei Villiers de l'Isle Adam*. Diss. Zurich, Leemann.  
 SCHOLLMEYER, V., *Gustave Flaubert in seinen Verhältnis zu Michel de Montaigne*. Diss. Greifswald, Adler.  
 SEILLÈRE, E., *Anatole France, critique de son temps* (Essais Critiques). 12 fr.  
 SORÉAU, E., *Pascal* (Les Grands Animateurs Chrétiens). Malfère. 15 fr.  
 TILLMANN, E., *Eugène-Melchior de Vogué*. Diss. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.  
 TSAO, H. W., *La Question d'argent dans le théâtre français sous le Second Empire*. 25 fr.  
 TURNER, R. E., *The Sixteenth Century in Victor Hugo's Inspiration*. New York, Inst. French Studies. \$1.  
 VIÉNOT, J., *Histoire de la Réforme française, II: De l'Édit de Nantes à sa révocation, 1598-1685*. Fischbacher. 75 fr.  
 VOLTAIRE, *Candide*. Figuière. 6 fr.  
 VOLTAIRE, *Romans et Contes*. Horizons de France. 160 fr.  
 WAIS, K., *Das antiphilosophische Weltbild des französischen Sturm und Drang, 1760-89* (Neue Forschung, 24). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 9 M.  
 WEINERT, H., *Dichtung aus dem Glauben, ein Beitrag zur Problematik des literarischen Renouveau Catholique in Frankreich* (Studien z. VKR., 19). Hamburg, Seminar f. roman. Spr. und Kultur. 4 M. 50.  
 WILSON, R. McN., *Madame de Stael* (Coll. Historique). Payot. 20 fr.

(d) *Provençal*.

- BLASI, F., *Le Poesie di Guilhem de la Tor* (Bibl. dell' AR., i, 21). Geneva, Olschki. 10 Sw. fr.  
 PELLEGRINI, S., *Il 'Pianto' anonimo Provenzale per Roberto d' Angiò*. Turin, Chiantore. L. 10.

## GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

- HEILIGENDORFF, W., *Der keltische Matronenkultus und seine Fortentwicklung im deutschen Mythos* (Form und Geist). 6 M. 50.  
 HOLTHAUSEN, F., *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch mit Einschluss der Eigennamen und der gotischen Lehnwörter im Romanischen* (Germanische Bibliothek). Heidelberg, Winter. 5 M. 50.

- LEUTHOLD, Dr., Die Runen und das Planetensystem. 1 M. 30.  
 SCHMIDT, L., Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerwanderung. Die Ostgermanen. Munich, Beck. 32 M.  
 SCHMIDT, W., Neuphilologie als Auslandswissenschaft auf der Grundlage des Sprachstudiums England. Marburg, Elwert 1 M.

**Scandinavian.**

- Edda Aus der Snorra-Edda, Thors Fahrt zu Útgardaloki, die Sigurdsage, herausg. von E. Mogk (Altnordische Übungstexte, 1). 1 M.  
 KJÆRGAARD, H., Die dänische Literatur der neuesten Zeit (1871–1933). 10s.  
 WETHLY, G., Henrik Ibsens Werk und Weltanschauung. Einzelbetrachtungen. (Elsass-Lothringische Wiss. Gesellschaft.) 18 fr.

**English.**

(a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, The. Vol. xiv, ed. by M. S. Serjeantson and L. N. Broughton. Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 7s. 6d.  
 BATESON, F. W., English Poetry and the English Language. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6s.  
 Concise Oxford Dictionary, The. 3rd ed., revised by H. W. Fowler and H. G. Le Mesurier. Oxford, Clarendon Press 7s. 6d.  
 Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, by Sir W. A. Craigie. Part iv, BROCKET-CHAMBER. Chicago and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s.  
 EDGAR, PELHAM, The Art of the Novel. From 1700 to the Present Time. Macmillan Co. 10s.  
 Essays by Divers Hands. Vol. XIII, ed. by W. B. Maxwell. London, H. Milford, for the Royal Society of Literature. 7s.  
 Essays of the Year 1933–1934. Argonaut Press. 5s.  
 FULLER, R., Literary Craftsmanship and Appreciation. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.  
 GALBRAITH, V. H., An Introduction to the Use of the Public Records. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5s.  
 GRANT, W., The Scottish National Dictionary, i, iv. Edinburgh, Scottish National Dictionary Association. Subscription price, £15.  
 HALKETT, H. and J. LAING, Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature. New and enlarged ed. by J. Kennedy, W. A. Smith, and A. F. Johnson. Vol. VII. Index and second supplement. Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd. 12 guineas the set.  
 HOGAN, J. J., An Outline of English Philology chiefly for Irish Students. Dublin and Cork, Educational Co. of Ireland 3s.  
 KAPP, RUDOLF, Heilge und Heiligenlegenden in England. Vol. I. Halle, Niemeyer. 14 M.  
 LEGGETT, H. W., The Idea in Fiction. Allen and Unwin. 5s.  
 LEGOUIS, E., A Short History of English Literature, transl. by V. F. Boyson and J. Coulson. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6s.  
 Subject Index to Periodicals, The, 1933. Library Association.  
 Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language. Second ed. Unabridged. Bell. 4 guineas.  
 WESTON, HAROLD, Form in Literature. A Theory of Technique and Construction. Rich and Cowan. 12s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- Dream of the Rood, The, ed. by B. Dickins and A. S. C. Ross (Methuen's O.E. Library, A 4). Methuen 2s.
- HITTMAIR, R., Aus Caxton's Vorreden und Nachworten (Aus Schrifttum und Sprache der Angelsachsen, 1). Leipzig, Noske 5 M.
- McNABB, V., Geoffrey Chaucer. A Study in Genius and Ethics St Dominic's Press. 5s.
- SLETTENGREEN, E., Contributions to the Study of French Loanwords in Middle English, 1. Orebo.
- Story of Troilus, The, as told by Benoît de Sainte-Maure, Giovanni Boccaccio (translated into English Prose), Geoffrey Chaucer and Robert Henryson. Translations and Introd. by R. K. Gordon. Dent 8s. 6d

(c) *Modern English.*

- AUSTEN, JANE, Northanger Abbey. Persuasion. Sanditon. (Vox ed.) Dent. 5s. each.
- BENNETT, JOAN, Four Metaphysical Poets. Donne: Herbert: Vaughan. Crashaw. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.
- BULLOUGH, G., The Trend of Modern Poetry. Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd. 5s.
- CECIL, Lord D., Early Victorian Novelists. Essays in Revaluation. Constable. 10s.
- CONNELY, W., Sir Richard Steele. Cape. 15s.
- CUNLIFFE, J. W., English Literature in the Twentieth Century. Macmillan Co. 12s. 6d.
- DRYDEN, J., Poems. Selected, with an Introd., by B. Dobrée. Dent. 2s.
- DRYDEN, J., Marriage à la Mode. Ed., with an Introd., Notes and Glossary, by J. R. Sutherland Dent. 1s. 6d.
- EASTMAN, M., Artists in Uniform. A Study of Literature and Bureaucratism. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.
- FLEMING, MARJORY, Journals, Letters and Verses, in collotype facsimile from the original manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland. Ed. by A. Esdaile. Sidgwick and Jackson 42s.
- Marjory Fleming, The Complete. Her Journals, Letters and Verses transcribed and ed. by F. Sidgwick. Sidgwick and Jackson. 5s.
- GAY, JOHN, The Beggar's Opera. Ed., with an Introd., Notes and Glossary, by F. W. Bateson. Dent. 1s. 6d.
- GRANVILLE-BARKER, H., The Study of Drama. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- HART, A., Shakespeare and the Homilies. Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses. 8s. 6d.
- HEARN, LAFCADIO, On Poets. Ed. by R. Tanabé, T. Ochiai and I. Nishizaki. Tokyo, Hokuseido Press.
- HENN, T. R., Longinus and English Criticism. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 6s.
- JENKINS, H., The Life and Work of Henry Chettle. Sidgwick and Jackson. 12s. 6d.
- KING, W., Matthew Arnold as a Poet. Shanghai, Kelly and Walsh.
- KINGSMILL, H., The Sentimental Journey. A Life of Charles Dickens. Wishart. 10s. 6d.
- LESLIE-MELVILLE, R., The Life and Work of Sir John Fielding. Lincoln Williams. 12s. 6d.
- LOCKETT, W. G., Robert Louis Stevenson at Davos. Hurst and Blackett. 10s. 6d.
- LYELL, J. P. R., Mrs Piozzi and Isaac Watts. Grafton. 5s.

- MASEFIELD, M., *Women Novelists from Fanny Burney to George Eliot*. Nicholson and Watson. 4s. 6d.
- MASSINGER, P., *The City Madam*, ed. by R. Kirk. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$2.00
- MAUROIS, A., *Dickens*. Translated by H. Miles. Lane. 5s.
- MILTON, J., *Works*, xvii. Columbia ed. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. £24 the set of 18 vols.
- Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse, The, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson and G. Bullough. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 8s. 6d.
- POPE-HENNESSY, UNA, *Edgar Allan Poe, 1809-1849*. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.
- POWELL, DILYS, *Descent from Parnassus*. Cresset Press. 6s.
- PURCELL, J. M., *Sidney's Stella*. New York, Oxford Univ. Press, London, Milford. 7s.
- QUILLER-COUGH, Sir A., *The Poet as Citizen, and other Papers*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 9s.
- RABELAIS, *Gargantua and Pantagruel*. Translated into English by Sir Thomas Urquhart and Peter le Motteux. Newly annotated. Oxford, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- REIMERS, H., *Jonathan Swift. Gedanken und Schriften uber Religion und Kirche* (Britannica, 9). Hamburg, Friederichsen, de Gruyter. 8 M. 50.
- RICHARDS, I. A., *Coleridge on Imagination*. Kegan Paul. 8s. 6d.
- SAINTSBURY, G., *Shakespeare (Cambridge Miscellany)*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.
- SCHORK, W., *Die Dramenplane Miltons*. Quakenbruck, C. Trute. 2 M. 50.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *The New Temple Shakespeare*, ed. by M. R. Ridley. *Hamlet, Titus Andronicus, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Timon of Athens, As You Like It, A Comedy of Errors, Coriolanus, The Taming of the Shrew, Love's Labour's Lost*. Dent. 2s. each
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Works*. Gathered into One Volume. Oxford, Blackwell. 6s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W., *Hamlet*. Ed. by J. Dover Wilson. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d.
- Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, '70, herausg. von W. Keller und H. Hecht. Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 8 M.
- SHELLEY, P. B., *Complete Poetical Works*, ed. by T. Hutchinson (Oxford Poets). Oxford, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- SHERBURN, G., *The Early Career of Alexander Pope*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15s.
- SINGH, BHUPAL, *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. Oxford, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- SITWELL, E., *Aspects of Modern Poetry*. Duckworth. 8s. 6d.
- SNITSLAAR, L., *Sidelights on Robert Browning's 'The Ring and the Book'*. Amsterdam, Swets and Zeitlinger. Fl. 2.75.
- Songs from the Restoration Theatre*, ed. by W. Thorp. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.
- SPENS, JANET, *Spenser's Faerie Queene, An Interpretation*. Edwin Arnold. 8s. 6d.
- Table Talk*. By Various Writers from Ben Jonson to Leigh Hunt. Ed. by J. C. Thornton. Dent. 2s.
- TOURNEUR, C., *The Revenger's Tragedy*. Ed., with an Introd., Notes and Glossary, by G. B. Harrison. Dent. 1s. 6d.
- TRENCH, W. F., *Tom Moore*. Dublin, At the Sign of the Three Candles. 2s. 6d.
- WILCOCK, G. D., *Shakespeare as Critic of Language (Shakespeare Assoc.)*. H. Milford. 2s.

WILLOUGHBY, E. E., A Printer of Shakespeare The Books and Times of William Jaggard. Philip Allan. 21s

WINWAR, F., The Rossettis and their Circle. Hurst and Blackett. 15s

### German.

#### (a) General (including Linguistic)

BERNT, A., Die Entstehung unserer Schriftsprache (Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation, herausg. von K. Burdach, 11). 25 M

Der Grosse Duden. Teil 2, Stulwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, bearbeitet unter Mitwirkung von O. Basler 4 M.

HOTZENKÖCHERLE, R., Die Mundart von Muttten, Laut und Flexionslehre (Beitrage zur schweizerdeutschen Grammatik) 12 M. 80.

KISCH, G., Siebenburgen im Lichte der Sprache. Registerband. (Ergänzungsband zu Palästra, 165.)

NAUMANN, H., Wandlung und Erfüllung. Reden und Aufsätze zur germanisch-deutschen Geistesgeschichte. 6 M. 85.

PAUL, H., Deutsches Wörterbuch. 4. Aufl. herausg. von K. Euling. Lief. 9. Halle, Niemeyer. 2 M.

SARAN, F., Deutsche Verskunst, ein Handbuch für Schule, Sprechsaal, Bühne, unter Mitwirkung von P. Habermann, herausg. von A. Riemann. 16 M.

VALENTIN, F., Geschichtlich-geographische Untersuchungen zu den Mundarten rings um Mainz (Frankische Forschungen, 2). Erlangen, Palm und Enke.

#### (b) Old and Middle High German.

KOHNLE, E. H., Studien zu den Ordnungsgrundsätzen mittelhochdeutscher Liederhandschriften (Tübinger germanistische Arbeiten) 9 M.

Marienlob. Das rheinische Marienlob, eine deutsche Dichtung des 13. Jahrhunderts, herausg. von A. Bach (Bibliothek des literar. Vereins in Stuttgart). 14 M.

OTFRID, Evangelienbuch, herausg. von O. Erdmann. 2te Auflage besorgt von E. Schroder. (Sammlung germanistischer Hilfsmittel, 1) 7 M.

ROTHER, J., Lob der Keuschheit. Herausg. von H. Naumann. (Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, 38.)

St Trudperter Hohe Lied, Das. Kritische Ausgabe von H. Menhardt. (Rhein. Beitr. und Hilfsbücher zur germ. Philologie und Volkskunde.) 6 M.

#### (c) Modern German.

ANNECKE, W., Max Dauthendey als Dramatiker. Würzburg, Tritsch. 2 M. 50.

ARNIM, L. A. von and CL. BRENTANO, Des Knaben Wunderhorn. T. 3. Leipzig, Insel. (Druck der Mainzer Presse.) 20 M.

BERNEY, A., Friedrich der Grosse. Tübingen, Mohr. 14 M.

BLUTH, K. T., Medizingeschichtliches bei Novalis (Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaft, 2). Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 60.

BOLTE, J., Von Wanderkomodianten und Handwerkerspielen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts (Preuss. Akademie). 2 M. 50.

BONDI, G., Erinnerungen an Stefan George. Mit einer Bibliographie. Berlin, Bondi. 1 M. 20.

BRIEGER, A., Kan und Abel in der deutschen Dichtung (Stoff- und Motivgeschichte der deutschen Literatur, 14). Berlin, de Gruyter. 4 M.

DAHMEN, H., Die nationale Idee von Herder bis Hitler. Köln, Schaffstein. 40 pf.

DÖRING, W., Zur pädagogischen Problematik des Begriffs des Klassischen (Göttinger Studien zur Pädagogik). Langensalza, Beltz. 4 M.

- EMRICH, W., Paulus im Drama (Stoff- und Motivgeschichte der deutschen Literatur, 13). Berlin, de Gruyter. 5 M.
- FUCHS, A., Les apports français dans l'œuvre de Wieland de 1772 à 1789 (Bibl. Rev. Litt. Comp., 101). Paris, Champion. 85 fr.
- FUCHS, A., Geistiger Gehalt und Quellenfrage in Wielands 'Abderiten'. Paris, Les Belles Lettres.
- German Romantic Lyrics, ed. by W. Silz. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 7s. 6d.
- GORRES, J., Naturwissenschaftliche und naturphilosophische Schriften, II (1793-1810) Hg. von R. Stem. (Joseph Gorres, Gesammelte Schriften, Bd. 2, 2. Hälfte) Köln, Bachem. 8 M.
- GOSSEL, E., Der Wortschatz der ersten deutschen Bibel (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 32). Giessen, v. Munchow. 2 M. 50.
- GOETHE The First Part of Goethe's 'Faust', trans. by J. Shawcross. London, Scholartis Press. 7s. 6d.
- Goethe-Kalender Hg. vom Frankfurter Goethe-Museum, 1935. Leipzig, Dieterich. 3 M. 50.
- HALLO, R., Rudolf Erich Raspe (Gottinger Studien, 5). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer 24 M.
- HENSS, R., Studien zu Hans Folz (Germanische Studien, 156). Berlin, Ebering. 9 M.
- HOFFMANN, P. T., Blut und Rasse im deutschen Dichter- und Denkertum. Hamburg, Hoffmann und Campe 1 M. 85.
- HOPPE, E., Liebe und Gestalt. Der Typus des Mannes in der Dichtung der Frau. Hamburg, Verlag Die Frau. 6 M.
- Jahrbuch der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 20. Hg. von Max Hecker. Weimar, Goethe-Gesellschaft.
- JUNGHANS, F., Das dramatische Theater deutscher Nation. Berlin, Verlag Die Runde. 2 M. 50.
- KORRODI, E., Deutsch-Schweizerische Freundschaft Briefe aus zwei Jahrhunderten. Berlin, Deutsche Buch-Gemeinschaft. 4 M. 75.
- LEYEN, F. von der, Deutsche Dichtung und deutsches Wesen. Köln, Schaffstein. 40 pf.
- LICHTENBERGER, H., Mélanges Henri Lichtenberger, hommage de ses élèves et de ses amis, Juin 1934 Paris, Stock. 30 fr.
- LOTE, R., Histoire de la 'culture' allemande Paris, Alcan. 100 fr.
- LUDEWIG, B., Der Lons. Gleichnis einer heldischen Kraft. München, Lehmann. 3 M.
- MEHL, O. J., Goethe und der Kultus. Eine liturgische Frucht des Goethejahres 1932. Grimmen, Grimmer Kreis-Zeitung. 2 M.
- MILCH, W., Daniel von Czepko Persönlichkeit und Leistung (Einzelschriften zur schlesischen Geschichte). Breslau, Trevendt und Granier 11 M.
- MÜLLER, G., Deutsches Dichten und Denken vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit (Sammlung Goschen). 1 M. 62 pf.
- MÜLLER, G., Staat, Volk und Recht bei Richard Wagner. Berlin-Grünwald, Verlag für Staatswissenschaft und Geschichte. 2 M.
- NIETZSCHE, FR., Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben (Kröners Taschenausgabe, 37). Leipzig, Kroner. 75 pf.
- PANSCH, O. W., Ludwig Uhland. Neue Studien zur romantischen Mythologie. Düsseldorf, Nolte. 2 M. 85.
- PETERSEN, O. F., Schiller in Russland, 1785-1805 (Deutsche Akademie in München, Bucherfolge 19). München, Reinhardt.

- PLATHOW, G., Das Wahrheitsproblem in Goethes Wissenschaft (Germanische Studien, 155). Berlin, Ebering 6 M.
- Publications of the English Goethe Society New Series. Vol. 10. Ed. by L. A. Willoughby. Cambridge, Univ. Press
- RIETSCHEL, O., Der Monch in der deutschen Dichtung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts (einschliesslich der Romantik) Wurzburg, Triltsch 3 M.
- ROSENFELD, B., Die Golemsage und ihre Verwertung in der deutschen Literatur (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Volker B Bd 5). Breslau, Priebatsch. 8 M.
- SCHLAGDENHAUFFEN, A., Frédéric Schlegel et son groupe la doctrine de l'Athenaeum (1798-1800). Publications de la Faculte des Lettres de Strasbourg. 50 fr.
- SCHNEIDER, H., Schiller, Werk und Erbe. Stuttgart, Cotta. 4 M 80.
- SCHOPENHAUER, A., Aphorismen zur Lebensweisheit (Kroners Taschenausgabe, 16). Leipzig, Kroner. 1 M. 75.
- STAHL, E. L., Die religiose und humanitätsphilosophische Bildungsidee und die Entstehung des deutschen Bildungsromans im 18. Jahrhundert (Sprache und Dichtung, 56). Bern, Haupt. 4 M. 80.
- STERNBERG, K., Der Ursprungsgedanke im biblischen Schöpfungsberichte und in Goethes 'Faust'. Berlin-Grunewald, Rothschild. 3 M
- STUDENTKOWSKI, K., Der dreissigjährige Krieg im Spiegel der historischen Novelle (Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen, 26). Jena, Frommann. 7 M. 50.
- Ur-Xenien. Nach der Handschrift des Goethe- und Schiller-Archivs in Faksimile-Nachbildung hg. v. H. Wahl (Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 47). Weimar, Goethe-Gesellschaft.
- VALLENTIN, A., Poet in Exile: the Life of Heinrich Heine. London, Gollancz. 10s. 6d.
- VOGT, FR. und M. KOCH, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 5. Aufl. neubearb. v. W. Koch. Bd. 2. Leipzig, Bibliographisches Institut. 9 M. 50.
- VOLLMER, H., Verdeutschung der Paulinischen Briefe, von den ersten Anfängen bis Luther. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte, mit neuen Texten, synoptischen Tabellen und 3 Bildtafeln. Hg. in Gemeinschaft mit F. Juhcher, W. Ludtke und R. Newald. (Bibel und deutsche Kultur. Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Bibel-Archivs in Hamburg, Bd. 4. Neue Folge der 'Materialien zur Bibelgeschichte': der Gesamtfolge Bd. 8.) Potsdam, Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion.
- WALDMAN, M., Goethe and the Jews. A Challenge to Hitlerism. Putnam. 10s. 6d
- WALLENSTEIN, P. R., Die dichterische Gestaltung der historischen Persönlichkeit, gezeigt an der Wallensteinfigur. Wurzburg, Triltsch. 2 M. 50.
- WALZEL, O., Romantisches (Mnemosyne, 18) Bonn, Rohrscheid. 7 M.
- ZORB, E. H., Religiöse Strömungen in der schlesischen Dichtung der Gegenwart (Sammlung Heitz, Reihe 10, Bd. 1). Strassburg, Heitz. 4 M.

THE IMAGERY OF 'THE REVENGERS TRAGEDIE'  
AND 'THE ATHEISTS TRAGEDIE'

SINCE the publication of Professor Nicoll's edition of the works of Tourneur in 1930,<sup>1</sup> the debate on the relations between the two plays, *The Revengers Tragedie* (pub. 1607) and *The Atheists Tragedie* (pub. 1611) has been reopened. Fresh evidence has been brought forward supporting and contesting Mr Oliphant's original verdict against Tourneur's authorship of *R.T.*,<sup>2</sup> and some contributions have been made to the discussion of the dates of writing of the two plays. The plays have now been compared and tested in the light of their dramatic technique, the characteristics of their thought, their choice of theme, their prosody and their style, including their vocabularies and syntactical peculiarities.<sup>3</sup> But so far no examination of the plays has been made in the light thrown by a comparison of their imagery, and as the means for such an examination has been amply furnished by Professor Caroline Spurgeon's illuminating studies of the imagery of Shakespeare's plays<sup>4</sup> it is perhaps time that an attempt should be made to indicate the nature of the evidence, both of authorship and of date, disclosed by this method.

As Professor Spurgeon has shown, the imagery of many Jacobean writers tends to fall into well-marked categories, and the subjects from which a writer thus spontaneously draws his imagery afford an index not only to the field of his experience but to the degree of intensity with which the different parts of his experience have been apprehended. Thus, the classification of the subjects of his imagery in a given play is likely to show a field peculiar to that writer at that stage of his development, yet clearly related to the groups which will be found in his work as a whole. Tourneur is no exception to this general law. If we examine first the *A.T.*, his accepted work, we find certain outstanding preoccupations.

Noticeable either for quantity or for persistent similarity of usage or both are four groups of images, one drawn from kingship and the

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Cyril Tourneur*, edited by Allardyce Nicoll. London: The Fawcett Press (1930)

<sup>2</sup> 'The authorship of the *Revengers Tragedy*', by E. H. C. Oliphant (*Studies in Philology*, April 1926)

<sup>3</sup> See various articles in *T.L.S.* (1930: Nov. 13, Dec. 18; 1931: Jan. 1, Feb. 5, Apr. 23, June 18) and in *P.M.L.A.* (1931, Sept.).

<sup>4</sup> See 'Imagery in the *Sir Thomas More* Fragment' (*R.E.S.* July 1930), *Leading Motives in the Imagery of Shakespeare's Tragedies* (O.U.P. 1930), *Shakespeare's Iterative Imagery* (Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1931), 'The use of imagery by Shakespeare and Bacon' (*R.E.S.* Oct. 1933).



apparatus of government, one from building, one from business and financial transactions, and one from outdoor nature in the specialised form of water and river imagery. On the other hand, there is relative or complete indifference to certain groups of subjects that occupy a large part in Shakespeare's imagery: animals, the body, domestic life (with the exception of a small but vivid group of food and cooking images), religion (not represented at all) and classical literature and legend (which has only two). There is an almost equal indifference to the astronomical themes that appear largely in the imagery of Marlowe, Chapman and Bacon. Other categories, again, which appear often in Shakespeare and many of his contemporaries are only perfunctorily used, clothes, sports, outdoor life (with the exception of gardening and water) occur seldom (and generally without much strength of feeling), and military images, though rather more frequent, are on the whole mechanical and dull.

Of the four groups mentioned above, those on government, national and local, are perhaps the least significant, but they are fairly numerous, some twenty in all (a king, a queen, the crown, a coronation, a royal progress, a salute of welcome; councillors, the Convocation House, the freedom of a city; traitors, conspirators, prisoners and the rack). Of these, though the majority are of little interest, some four or five are images of great poetic intensity and stand sharply out from the rest of the group and from the more casual usage of the majority of the military metaphors:

Nature thou art a Traytour to my soule,  
Thou hast abus'd my trust. I will complaine  
To a superiour Court, to right my wrong.  
I'll prove thee a forger of false assurances.  
In yond' Starre chamber thou shalt answere it.

*A.T.* v, 1, 140-4.

Here in one brief passage Tourneur characteristically unites the startling blend of pun and poetic metaphor in the last line with the precise use of the technical term 'assurances' (terms of peace, truces) in strict harmony with the main metaphor of the traitor arraigned before Star Chamber.

The other three groups are all more noteworthy. Those on building are few, only five or six in all, but they are united in two respects; they are drawn exclusively from one aspect, the founding, raising and subsequent fall of a building, and are, I think without exception, used only to illustrate the founding, rearing and overthrowing of the family of d'Amville. They are thus a genuine chain, though a slender one, of iterative imagery and show a marked preoccupation with an isolated aspect of a theme and an inseparable series of associations. Characteristic of this group

of images are D'Amville's words in the fifth act when he hears of the approaching death of the second of his two sons.

His gasping sighes are like the falling noise  
Of some great building when the ground-worke breakes.  
On these two pillars stood the stately frame,  
And architecture of my loftie house  
An Earthquake shakes 'em. The foundation shrinkes  
Deare Nature<sup>1</sup> in whose honour I have rais'd  
A worke of glory to posteritie,  
O burie not the pride of that great action,  
Under the fall and ruine of it selfe.

*A.T.* v, i, 92-100.

In spite of the length to which the image is drawn out a clear relation between the idea and the picture is maintained at each modification; the whole passage is a precise and delicate piece of modulating, as are all the long-drawn images in the play.

The business and financial images are distinguished from those of many of Tourneur's contemporaries not only by their tone, which is full of respect and interest (widely removed from what may be called the 'Alarm-against-usurers' mood of many contemporary treatments of the subject, either directly or in imagery), but also by the technical knowledge they reveal and the lucidity with which they are developed, often through a complex but exquisitely articulated series. There is, throughout the group, a faultless precision, even more noticeable than that of the building image quoted above, in the relation of the image to the object it illustrates. The series touches subjects such as trade, investments, contracts, indentures, repayment of debt and book-keeping. A definite area of experience is indicated by such a group as this, and so familiar does Tourneur seem with it that we are tempted to credit him with professional experience:

Sir, I will *take* your friendship *up at use*.  
And feare not that your *profit* shall be small;  
Your *interest* shall excede your *principall*.

*A.T.* i, ii, 154-6.

Set downe the Body. Pay earth what shee *lent*,  
But shee shall beare a living monument,  
To let succeeding ages truely know,  
That shee is *satisfied*, what hee did *owe*:  
Both *principall* and *use*; because his *worth*  
Was better at his death then at his birth.

*A.T.* iii, i, 3-8.

In all cases these images, though of relatively low tension, bear the most rigorous inspection and have the characteristic *lumen succum* which Bacon held indispensable to true perception.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Advancement of Learning*, Book i.

## 292 'The Revengers Tragedie' and 'The Atheists Tragedie'

The last group is of greater personal interest. It is the imagery of a man who at some time in his life (I should think at an early and impressionable period) lived in a district where rivers and their tributaries were the main features of the landscape. More than this, I should say it was the imagery of a man who had handled small sail-boats on these same waters and had learnt to watch winds and tides and the habits of currents and mingling streams.<sup>1</sup>

I prithe thee let this current of my teares,  
Direct thy inclination from the warre. *A.T. I, II, 2-3.*

blood, whose unmoov'd streame was never drawne  
Into the current of affection. *A.T. I, IV, 7-8.*

Of peculiar interest is the extreme precision of the image of tributary water running into and, for a short distance after the junction, flowing above the swifter undercurrent of the main stream:

So thou conclud'st that pleasure onely flows  
Upon the streame of riches. *A.T. I, I, 33-4.*

While a survey, even so brief as this, of the categories of his imagery tells us something of the field of his experience, an examination of his treatment of images indicates clearly certain of the habits of his mind.

At the risk perhaps of making an over-arbitrary distinction, I would suggest that Tourneur's imagery falls into two main classes, one in which the imagery has the rare and sudden quality of inevitable poetry, a peculiar mark of the Jacobean, which Tourneur shares with Webster, Marston, Bacon, Ben Jonson (as a prose writer), Raleigh and Earle and many more; the other which, seen in the *lumen siccum*, has a quality more particularly his own, a gift of lucidity and delicate adjustment of image to theme which, while it often robs the image of intensity and of grandeur, gives a precision, an almost scientific exactness to an illustration. This is often unperceived at first sight, but upon closer inspection it yields that delight proper to exquisite and unobtrusive modulation, or the delight we associate with the engineer's finished diagram, a thing of beauty at once for its clarity amid complexity, its economy of line and its matter-of-fact serviceableness.

This distinction meets us early in the play. D'Amville, exulting in the murder of Montferrers and the thunder of the storm that has so generously helped his designs, turns to welcome Borachio as he climbs from the pit where he has left the corpse:

Lonely Night-Raven,  
Th'ast seiz'd a carkasse,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In view of Professor Nicoll's suggestion that Cyril Tourneur belonged to the Great Parndon Tourneurs, it is perhaps not fantastic to see here the now famous sailing waters of Essex or Suffolk.

<sup>2</sup> *A.T. II, IV, 107-8* (ed. Nicoll). But Nicoll reads 'lovely' with the edition of 1611.

and a little later he exclaims in the same mood

Now farewell blacke night;  
Thou beauteous Mistresse of a murderer.<sup>1</sup>

This is the very language of Marston at his best, and its potency lies as much in its simplicity as in its brevity.

But when at the beginning of the same act, Borachio recites a long and carefully prepared description of the supposed death of Charlemont and of the ocean lapping about his body, he gives us a description which, though in this case there is a certain prettiness not common with Tourneur, presents a feat in sustained and related imagery such as few of his contemporaries cared to achieve:

the weeping Sea, (like one;  
Whose milder temper doth lament the death  
Of him whom in his rage he slew) runnes up  
The Shoare; embraces him; kisses his cheekes,  
Goes backe againe and forces up the Sandes  
To burie him; and ev'rie time it parts,  
Sheds teares upon him; till at last (as if  
It could no longer endure to see the man  
Whom it had slaine, yet loath to leave him;) with  
A kinde of unresolv'd unwilling pace,  
Winding her waves one in another, like  
A man that foldes his armes, or wrings his hands  
For griefe; ebb'd from the body and descends  
As if it would sinke downe into the earth,  
And hide it selfe for shame of such a deede.<sup>2</sup>

It is this same clear-sighted perception that dictates the close, sometimes toughly interwoven images quoted above<sup>3</sup> and gives us briefer ones of the same calibre:

Dreames are but the rais'd  
Impressions of premeditated things,  
By serious apprehension left upon  
Our mindes.<sup>4</sup>

And the two modes fuse triumphantly now and again in such an image as D'Amville's

*D'Am.* Here was a murther bravely carryed, through  
The eye of observation, unobserv'd.  
*Bor.* And those that saw the passage of it, made  
The Instruments....

The unerring precision of image after image such as these, which never falters throughout the play, reveals itself at last as a major characteristic of Tourneur's habit of mind. As his poetic imagery is close and inevitable, so is this other, his explanatory imagery precise and delicately accurate. In contrast with Marston, his immediate predecessor and to some extent

<sup>1</sup> *A.T.* II, iv, 203-4.

<sup>3</sup> Especially the images drawn from finance.

<sup>2</sup> *A.T.* II, i, 92-106.

<sup>4</sup> *A.T.* II, vi, 29-32.

his teacher, this is the more notable. In the whole of the play I have only been able to find one instance of an image whose subject defied analysis (the commonest of several difficulties met in examining the imagery of Marston) and only two in which there seemed any weakness of articulation between the image and its theme (the second in order of formidableness of the difficulties offered by Marston). All three of these, moreover, may alternatively be accounted for by failure of intelligence on the part of the reader.

But imagery is not always easily distinguished from certain habits of speech that border upon the figurative and the literal at once, and in this debatable and extremely difficult territory there are also discernible certain characteristics of Tourneur's mind. There is perhaps no Jacobean dramatist whose personification is more difficult to distinguish from literal usage or who more bewilderingly blends pun and image or moves from one to the other with a more subtle appreciation of the intricate interplay possible between the two. Indeed, after a prolonged study of the imagery of this play this habit of crossing and recrossing the debatable borderland between pun and image, or between personification and a literal meaning, appears to be the other major characteristic of his process, second only in significance to the lucidity with which the true images are defined.

When D'Amville says of Nature, whom he regards as a kind of tutelary deity, that she 'winck'd At our proceedings' he is clearly speaking metaphorically. When a little later he says

Nature (since herself decay doth hate)  
Should favour those that strengthen their estate,

it is doubtful whether this is personification at all and not a mechanical use of what was once an image and has since passed into an accepted subsidiary meaning of the term (as has happened with the modern 'ardent'). But a real difficulty meets us with a usage which seems to me to fall between the two and is of a kind very frequent with Tourneur:

That shows there's nothing in a man above  
His nature; if there were, considering 'tis  
His being's excellency, 'twould not yield  
To nature's weakness.

And what, knowing Tourneur's habit of personifying the faculties and processes of the mind (often of his own classifying), are we to make of lines such as 'My astonish'd minde inform'd me I had seene' or 'Thinking to make her apprehension bold', which appear to me to maintain a perfect balance between personification and literal statement?

The habit of playing to and fro across the borderline of pun and image is equally common. When D'Amville interrupts the music to hear the news of the supposed messenger from Ostend with the words 'He brings the news that makes our music full', it is pretty obvious that nothing more is meant than a pun on the general and the technical senses of the word 'full'. But there is something more subtly balanced in the adjustment of his words in Act IV:

Sure there is  
Some other happiness *within the freedom*  
Of the conscience than my knowledge e'er attained to,

where there is, I judge, a pun involving an image (the freedom of a city) as one of its meanings. Better still is the dialogue between Sebastian and Belforest where an image begets a pun which in its turn fathers an image capable simultaneously of a literal interpretation

*Bel.* Villaine, give mee way,  
Or I will make my passage through thy bloud.  
*Seb.* My bloud will make it slipperie my Lord.  
T'were better you would take another way.  
You may hap fall else.

Tourneur is by no means the only Jacobean dramatist who interweaves pun and image or slips from personification to the literal and back again, but with him the occurrence is so frequent and the modulating so subtle as to suggest that his mind took a peculiar delight in these delicate discriminations.

We may sum up, then, some of the qualities of Tourneur's imagery by saying that it suggests a man whose habit of mind was at once delicately accurate, with something of a logician's love of fine distinctions and discriminating comparisons, and at the same time capable of that sudden penetration into hidden relations, that revelatory vision of the oneness at the roots of the apparently unrelated which seems to characterise Elizabethan and Jacobean metaphor, especially among the dramatists, like a legacy from a sixteenth-century Aristotelianism whose interpretation of the universe habitually sought the one in the many. Side by side with these two major types of image in Tourneur, we notice a preoccupation with certain subjects which indicate a man who has at one time in his life been intimate with rivers and streams and in a less degree with outdoor life generally, and has been moulded also by a close experience of business and finance; we may add that this man also appears to have an interest, though less deep, in kings, courts and some of the machinery of government and to reveal an isolated prepossession, the idea of the rise and collapse of buildings. He shows a perfunctory knowledge of military matters and a notable lack of interest in some themes,

## 296 'The Revengers Tragedie' and 'The Atheists Tragedie'

such as religion and classical legend, which concerned his contemporary dramatists more nearly.

If now we consider the imagery of the *Revengers Tragedie*, we find there some arresting likenesses and some subsidiary but interesting differences. The categories which are most notable either for quantity or for some quality in their usage in this play are images from the body (particularly bodily movement<sup>1</sup> and disease), images from building, images from business (particularly that connected with the holding and transfer of property), images from domestic life (particularly food, cooking and the work of a large country house), images from gardening and farming, from military life (particularly siege operations) and images from nature, especially of rivers, streams and winds. Conspicuous among the subjects neglected or omitted are religion and classical literature and legend.

In this series there are at once noticeable the three unusual and unconnected groups, building, business transactions and river and stream imagery, which were also prominent in *A.T.* and the almost complete omission of two of the groups untouched there. The resemblance in detail is also strong. The building images are not always associated with one theme as they are in *A.T.*, but with one exception they are drawn from exactly the same aspect, the laying of the foundation, the raising of a building, a building standing firm, undermined and falling and a fallen building or monument. The business images are equally interestingly grouped, the relations of tenant and landlord, the management of estates, the transfer of property, a dowry, the handling of capital; these are all long, accurately manipulated and extremely effective images. In addition to these there are less impressive but perhaps no less interesting images from auctions, money-changing, bonds, bankruptcy, interest and usury, debt and a little group from the routine of an office.<sup>2</sup> The river and stream imagery differs hardly at all from that of *A.T.* either in quantity or emphasis, unless it be that the experience in *R.T.* seems a little more immediate and personal (and perhaps fresher in the memory), while that in *A.T.* is more generalised; it is concerned with streams, with a river overflowing its banks, the roar of water, water washing away land, tides, winds, a swimmer out of his depth, a man rowing against the tide, a boat coming about, a sunk anchor (? twice), and, three times, a windlass.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There are sixty of these in all, of which thirty are images of bodily movement or action and only four of the sixty are repetitions of the same aspect.

<sup>2</sup> Ink, pens, ruling account books, sending letters, signing documents and registers.

<sup>3</sup> Pertinent perhaps also is the unusual and vivid image of the hermit crab (*R.T.* iv, iv, 4-15).

The other four outstanding groups are notably missing from *A.T.* as the government group there is missing from *R.T.* The body group is largely concerned either with rapid movement or with disease [it might be pertinent to notice that in the case of another early Jacobean, Marston, the body images, particularly of disease, maiming and destruction, have a notable preponderance in the Satires and the first *Antonio* play (a preponderance which diminishes rapidly in the second *Antonio* play and is of normal proportions in the *Malcontent*), and that they show certain characteristics in common with those of *R.T.* and suggest a similar phase]. The images from domestic life are in part represented in *A.T.* by the small but vivid group on food and cooking, but in *R.T.* not only are these greater in number, detail and if possible in vividness, but there are added to them some, also of great vividness, peculiar to the running of a large Elizabethan farm or manor house, spinning, weaving, knitting, dyeing, moulding wax (? candles), brewing, distilling, and grinding tools. In the same way, those from farming and gardening are fuller and clearer and seem mainly concerned with fruit growing; there is one very notable image that suggests the experience of a county subject to frequent droughts; an echo of the same experience is to be found in a similar image in *A.T.* The military images are not of great significance, but they appear to be drawn mainly from those aspects which would concern an ordinary soldier's experience, the only notable point about them being the constant repetition of siege images.

Judging, therefore, from the evidence of the categories alone, it would seem that the author of *R.T.* was a countryman by breeding, brought up on a relatively large farm or manor, belonging to a district in which rivers and streams were a main feature of the landscape though perhaps also subject to drought.<sup>1</sup> He had also a well-digested knowledge of certain business transactions, particularly those concerned with the administering of landed property and with the routine of a lawyer's office. That he was a young man might I think be inferred from his preoccupation with the body (a preoccupation that Marston also showed in his youth and grew out of). That he had some knowledge of soldiering, at least to the extent of having been involved in a siege, might, I think, be suggested.<sup>2</sup> Again, in common with the author of *A.T.*, he has a curious preoccupation with the raising and the fall of buildings. So far, then, the chances of these two men being one appear pretty strong.

<sup>1</sup> The rivers and the drought would narrow the issue to one district only and that East Anglia in which Tournear may perhaps have been reared.

<sup>2</sup> If Tournear actually took part in the siege of Ostend in 1601, this group of images would readily find its source.



## 298 'The Revengers Tragedie' and 'The Atheists Tragedie'

They are confirmed by the evidence offered by the treatment of imagery in *R.T.* Here, again, the distinction might be drawn between the imagery which penetrates its subject with a sudden, passionate and inevitable illumination and that which quietly and lucidly traces an affiliation, a process essentially intellectual and dispassionate. It is the distinction between Vindice's cry 'Oh one incestuous kiss picks open hell', and the ordered sequence of his later words at the sight of Gratiana's repentant tears:

Yfaith tis a sweete shower, it dos much good.  
The fruitfull grounds, and meadowes of her soule,  
Has beene long dry: powre downe thou blessed dew;  
Rise Mother, troth this shower has made you higher...  
Farewell once dried, now holy-watred Meade.

*R.T.* iv, iv, 55-8, 94.

Again, as in *A.T.*, the *lumen siccum* is necessarily at its driest in the group of financial images, some of which have been quoted above. But there are in this play, distinguishing it from *A.T.*, a number of cases in which the precision of outline falters, in which the *lumen siccum* becomes, what Bacon deprecates, a *lumen madidum*, and outlines are softened and confused, as so often happens with Marston. Most often, it is only a moment's faltering only noticeable by contrast with the precision of the rest of the articulation:

For had hee cut thee a right Diamond,  
Thou hadst beene next set in the Duke-doomes Ring,  
When his worne selfe like Ages easie slave,  
Had dropt out of the Collet into th' Grave.

*R.T.* i, ii, 169-172.

To much Jacobean imagery the momentary inaccuracy which implies that the diamond is worn rather than the setting would be normal and unnoticed. But our experience of *A.T.* tells us that in the whole extent of its imagery there is no confusion of this kind; indeed its triumph and distinctive mark is its unfailing clarity. Nor can we find there an instance of an image running away with its theme and confusing thereby the impression it was designed to sharpen, as Lussurioso's lines in *R.T.*:

for offences  
Gilt ore with mercy, show like fayrest women,  
Good onely for their beauties, which washt of, no sin is ouglier,

*R.T.* i, ii, 32-4.

where the relation of mercy and sin is not strictly illustrated by that of deceptive paint upon an ugly face, and where the emphasis upon the inaccurately drawn parallel only serves to focus our attention upon the divergence. These cases, of which there are others in the course of the play, seem to indicate an incomplete development of that dry perception

which is itself a distinctive characteristic of maturity. Relative immaturity is, I think, also indicated in a certain grotesque imagery very like Marston's and like his often occurring in close conjunction with or even allied to fine poetic illumination.

Throwne inck upon the for-head of our state  
Which envious spirits will dip their pens into  
After our death, and blot us in our Toombes.

*R.T.* I, II, 7-9.

Here the recovery is surprising and there is the same sense of power masked in confusion in

My Lords, be all of Musick, strike old griefes into other countries  
That flow in too much milke, and have faint livers,

*R.T.* v, II, 2-3.

while the very mood of Marston's imagery is in 'Yet all the world meets round in the same bent', with its power derived not from the picture (which defies analysis) but from an impression like the memory of a gesture or a movement.

Finally, in his love of puns and personifications, particularly in a delight he seems to find in crossing and recrossing the borderline between them, blending the two modes of thought or deriving one from another, the author of *R.T.* seems to show a process of mind almost identical with that of the author of *A.T.* If anything, his delight is keener. 'He makes horne royall', says Vindice as he watches the duke's bastard son cross the stage with the duchess, and the double meaning of 'royall' gives a crispness to the otherwise stale image. Again, in

May not hereafter times open in as faire faces as this?  
They may if they can paint so well,

*R.T.* v, I, 21-2.

the sudden change from the gentle image of the opening flower to the bitter hint of fraud and superficiality itself depends upon the double implication in the word 'face'; the pun has become a pivot by which he turns from one metaphor to the other. The arch-achievement in this kind is the otherwise not very effective line of the duchess to her absent husband, 'Ile arme thy brow with woman's Herauldrie', where what began as the simple (and by this time wearisome) metaphor (the horn) takes in by the way a play upon the meaning of arm (verb) and heraldic arms which in turn leads on to the metonymy of substituting 'Herauldrie' for 'horn' which has by now become the heraldic symbol. The greater delight in these juggling feats is, I think, consistent with the relative immaturity shown in other respects in the treatment of imagery.

In view then of the great likeness in certain distinctive habits of mind that occur in both plays; the unusual precision of the drier imagery;

the power of sustaining this precision through unusually long and articulated series; the delight in intellectual agility side by side with the gift of deep and penetrating poetic imagery; in view of a preponderance in both plays of images drawn from certain well-defined and yet unconnected fields of experience—business and finance, building, water and watermanship—I am convinced that the same man was the author of both and that if, in the case of *A.T.*, his name was Cyril Tourneur that was undoubtedly also the name of the author of *R.T.* But because of certain differences in the field of experience suggested by the categories of imagery and because of relatively different stages in the development of his characteristic mental processes suggested by the treatment of the images, I think that we are handling plays with an interval of some years between them. Further, because these differences all point to a clearer habit of thought in *A.T.* than in *R.T.*, to superlative precision and a complete elimination of confused or turbulent emotion, to the loss of certain obsessions (the body and its functions), to the dimming of certain memories (country life within doors and without and the memories of military service), I have no hesitation in placing *R.T.* before *A.T.* in date. For all its greater passion and force, its greater co-ordination of plot and its amazing synthesis of passions into unity of mood, *R.T.* is, on the evidence afforded by an examination of the imagery, the play of a less mature mind than that which wrote the *A.T.*, though assuredly the same mind. If any doubt remained to be resolved, would it not be so by the consideration, in the light of the evidence as a whole, of the passage which represents the culminating achievement of imagery in either play? It is a passage equally in the key of both moods and the only passage in either which synthesises at once the qualities which we have traced through the imagery of both; the precise and sustained articulation and the swift and terrible penetration else only found in disjunction are, in the fifth act of *A.T.*, found in complete union. D'Amville, face to face with the Death's head, looks back with sudden realisation upon the night of storm and darkness when he had exulted in his triumphant murder. With ruthless accuracy Tourneur knits up into this passage of shuddering horror the triumphant imagery of the earlier scene:

And that Bawde,  
The skie, there; she could shut the windowes and  
The doores of this great chamber of the world;  
And draw the curtaines of the clouds betweene  
Those lights and me about this bed of earth,  
When that same Strumpet Murder and my selfe  
Committed sin together. Then she could

Leave us i' the darke, till the close deed  
 Was done: But now, that I begun to feele  
 The loathsome horror of my sinne, and (like  
 A Leacher emptied of his lust) desire  
 To burie my face under my eye-browes, and  
 Would steale from my shame unseene, she meetes me  
 I' the face with all her light corrupted eyes,  
 To challenge payment o' mee. *A.T. iv, iii, 244-58.*

What had been one of the main conscious themes of the earlier play reappears as imagery in the later play (whose main theme is quite other) at the two moments of highest tension in d'Amville's life, here and in the scene of the murder of Montferrers (Act II, sc. IV). It is significant that, when the passion and preoccupation of the earlier play reappear in the later as imagery, it is imagery which, for power and swiftness of effect, far surpasses that of any other part of the play.

U. M. ELLIS-FERMOR.

LONDON.

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE ROLLE AND WYCLIFITE PSALTERS UPON THE PSALTER OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION

OF no other Biblical book do we possess so many Early English translations as of the Book of Psalms. If extant manuscripts are any indication, some of these translations must have been rather widely spread over England in their day. We have twelve manuscripts of the Old English glossed Psalters; three of the Middle English Midland Prose Psalter; six of the Middle English Metrical Psalter; and of Rolle's translation and commentary some thirty-five copies. In addition there is the almost complete Old English translation, the Paris Psalter, part in prose and part in verse, and there is reason to believe that the metrical translation, at least, once existed for the whole Psalter. An English Psalter was by no means a new thing even when Wyclif and his followers, in the latter part of the fourteenth century, undertook their great task of Biblical translation.

Rolle's English Psalter, for example, enjoyed a widespread popularity during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. 'It was owned by officials of religious houses, by private persons who used it, as a family Bible might be used, for their obits (as by Lord Thomas Berkeley, whose illuminated copy still exists).'<sup>1</sup> Among the many monastic catalogues compiled between the years 1408 and 1526, the only English Biblical book recorded is Rolle's Psalter.<sup>2</sup>

Besides this direct evidence for the widespread use of English Psalters during the later Middle Ages, we know, of course, that the Psalter has always been of major importance in the services of the Church, and further that the Psalms have been in all ages near to the hearts of the devout. Thus it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Psalms in English versions were familiar to numbers of men long before their first translation into Modern English during the sixteenth century.

In his admirable essay, 'The Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and His School,' which appears in the introduction to the Early English Text Society's edition of Harpsfield's *Life of More*, Raymond W. Chambers shows that the traditions of English prose extend in an

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Allen, *English Writings of Richard Rolle, Hermit of Hampole* (Oxford, 1931), p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Margaret Deanesly, *The Lollard Bible and other Medieval Biblical Versions* (Cambridge, 1920), p. 331.

unbroken line back to the days of King Alfred. May it not be that our English Psalters likewise represent a continuous thread of Biblical translation extending from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries back at least to 1300? Does the language of the Authorised Version reflect to any degree at all the language employed in the Middle English versions? In short, was there established in the Middle Ages an English tradition for translating the Psalter?

The thesis that the early versions influenced later ones must rest, of course, on internal evidence. The translators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we know, had German, French, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew texts to work with, but we do not know that they made direct reference to any existing English translations. It is not even necessary, however, to assume that they did. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries English Psalters (including the second Wyclifite version, of which there are some hundred and forty manuscripts extant) were widely used. Many of these English Psalms must have been thoroughly familiar to devout Christians. Many of the passages in them must have taken a firm place in men's minds and hearts. It is surely possible, if not probable, that the translators found echoing in their memories English phrases for the passages they were engaged upon. The process may have been partly conscious, partly unconscious. Much had to be changed in the newer versions for the sake of interpretation. Literary excellence demanded many more changes. But turns of phrase, English Biblical expressions, already established by long use, may certainly have found their way into the versions which were to become enduring for the English-speaking race.

When we turn to the internal evidence, we find it overwhelming. A comparison of the language of the Psalms in the Authorised Version with that in the two principal Middle English versions, Rolle's and the second Wyclifite, reveals hundreds of verses and parts of verses similar in phraseology. Some of the verses are markedly alike in all three versions, many in the Wyclifite and Authorised, and some few in the Rolle and Authorised. Frequently, moreover, where the Authorised agrees with one or both of the Middle English versions, some of the sixteenth-century translations vary widely from the Authorised. A study of these Bibles, chiefly the Coverdale of 1535, the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva of 1560, and the Bishops' of 1568, reveals, incidentally, the variety of English phraseology ready for the use of translators. The Biblical phrases, however, which seem to strike their roots in mediæval soil, usually appear in one or more of the English Bibles which were the forerunners of the

King James. There would seem to be a continuity traceable from the Middle Ages to 1611.

In the following discussion of the three versions of the Psalms, the Rolle, the second Wyclifite, and the Authorised, there will appear examples of the similarities found among them. These examples are typical of over five hundred which have been discovered. The verses presented here are taken from H. R. Bramley's edition of Rolle's English Psalter and Commentary (Oxford, 1884), Forshall and Madden's edition of the Wyclifite Bibles (Oxford, 1850), and William Aldis Wright's *Hexaplar Psalter*, containing, among five others, the 1611 version (Cambridge, 1911). The abbreviation *R.* will be used to designate Rolle's Psalter, *W.* the Wyclifite, and *A.* the Authorised. The references to chapters and verses, unless otherwise indicated, are in the numbering of the Authorised Version

That the English language underwent notable changes between 1340 and 1611 scarcely needs to be mentioned. But that, alongside of this linguistic evolution, the art of translating into English made rapid strides forward during these three hundred years is here of greater significance. This development is clearly seen by merely a hasty examination of our three versions. Rolle's English rendering of the Psalms is in many places crude; the Psalms in the Authorised Version are couched in the finest of English prose. This truth is too obvious to require elaborate illustration; a few examples follow (the chapter and verse numbering under *R.* is as in Bramley's edition):

<i>R.</i>	<i>A.</i>
4. 1. In tribulacioun thou made brad til me	4. 1. Thou hast enlarged mee when I was in distresse.
5. 11. Grafe oppenand is the throt of thaim.	5. 9. Their throat is an open sepulchre.
9. 4. Thou sitth on trone that demys rightwisnes.	9. 4. Thou satest in the throne rudging right.
11. 7. The wordis of lord wordis chaste.	12. 6. The wordes of the Lord are pure wordes.

We observe in *R.* a frequent slavish adherence to the Latin, as in the last example just given, where the Vulgate reads, 'Eloquia domini eloquia casta', or in the second quotation, 'Sepulcrum patens est guttur eorum'. Latin present participles are usually rendered literally, as in the second example above, or as in Ps. 32. 18 (Rolle's numbering), where the 'super metuentes eum' is translated 'on dredand him'. Some of this awkward literalness is doubtless accounted for by the fact that Rolle did not intend to make a free, idiomatic translation. In a sense his English verses are a gloss, for they accompany the Latin closely and are

followed by expositions which often depend on individual Latin words. Close literalness was very likely aimed at, and the exposition would take care of the sense. Further, the orthodox attitude toward Biblical translation in the fourteenth century opposed free prose renderings apart from the Latin base and apart from the established interpretation. English was not yet an acceptable vehicle for Scripture; 'bare texts' were out of ecclesiastical favour.

Limitations of vocabulary are also apparent in *R.* 'Deliver', 'trust', 'salvation', 'congregation', 'iniquity', 'countenance', 'truth', and many other words which are used over and over again in the later versions seldom or never appear in *R.* These few particulars illustrate the difference between the translation of the mediæval age and that of the modern.

Richard Rolle's importance to the development of English prose style is unquestioned. As Professor Chambers declares,<sup>1</sup> 'Rolle's date, his style, and his popularity give him a supreme place in the history of English prose'. The style and language of his translation of the Psalms, nevertheless, can hardly be called entirely successful. At times, to be sure, he translates with great felicity and his expressions bring to mind our own modern Psalter. But for the most part his style in the translation lacks freedom, ease, and frequently clearness. In the words of Miss Allen, it 'on the whole sounds like an experiment'.<sup>2</sup>

The language of the second Wyclifite version shows many of the same peculiarities as does that of Rolle, and yet obviously the English prose of *W.* was a better vehicle for Biblical translation than was that of *R.*<sup>3</sup> Slavish literalness has for the most part disappeared. Here we read already, 'Her throte is an opyn sepulchre', 'Thou, that demest rightfulness, hast set on the trone', 'The spechis of the Lord ben chast spechis'. The Wyclifite revisers would never let an adjective stand alone as a substantive, even when it might do so with propriety and advantage. They were not satisfied with Rolle's 'as defe', 'as dumbe', but made a finished translation with 'as a deaf man', 'as a dounb man' (Ps. 38. 13). And when the Authorised was content with 'the righteous', and 'the

<sup>1</sup> 'The Continuity of English Prose', p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> *English Writings of Richard Rolle*, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Professor Chambers declares ('Continuity of English Prose', p. 103). 'Whilst Rolle writes modern English, the first Wyclifite version, written thirty-five years after Rolle's death, is almost incredibly crude.' Professor Chambers, however, fails to consider that the aim of the translators of the early Wyclifite version was very likely to make a literal rendering and not a free one (see Workman, *John Wyclif*, 2. 162). If he had compared Rolle's translation of the Psalter, instead of Rolle's prose found elsewhere, with the earlier Wyclifite translation, he would not have found a great difference; whereas the style of the later Wyclifite is greatly superior to both the early Wyclifite and the Rolle Psalters.



heathen', *W.* has 'a iust man', 'hethene men'. Another peculiarity of *W.* is the insertion of the subject 'thou' after imperatives. Therefore when *R.* and *A.* have 'Aske of me', *W.* reads 'Axe thou of me' (Ps. 2. 8), again, *W.* reads 'here thou my preier' (Ps. 4. 1), and 'kepe thou me as the appil of the 13e' (Ps. 17. 8). Such instances are readily found in this Psalter. In this version, too, many of the terms which become commonplace in *A.* are not yet employed. 'Praise' is usually 'heriying'; 'trust' is almost invariably 'hope', 'meditation' is 'thenkyng', 'iniquity' is still 'wickednesse'.

It is of interest and significance to note how many words and phrases in *A.* are translated by fixed counterparts in one or both of the other versions. 'Wrath', for example, is almost always translated 'ire' in *W.* and 'wreth' in *R.*, 'feare' is 'drede' ('dred') in the two Middle English Psalters; while 'praise' is usually either 'knouleche to' in *W.* and 'shrive to' in *R.*, or else 'herie' in *W.* and 'loue' in *R.* A knowledge of the more common of these parallel renderings of certain expressions is of help in comparing the three versions. Where the change of certain words to certain other words is established, we expect the modern translation to vary from the early with respect to those words, even though the wording of the rest of the passage remains similar.

Many of the expressions peculiar to the Middle English translations, of course, may be explained by reference to the Vulgate base. For example, the 'in to the world, and in to the world of world' of *W.* (*R.*, 'in warld and in warld of warld'), rendered in *A.* 'for euer and euer', is but the literal translation of the Vulgate's 'in saeculum et in saeculum saeculi'. But, although it explains certain peculiarities in the early translation, the fact that the later versions were based upon different sources also gives more weight to the similarities that we find. Considering this difference in sources, we might well expect to find little similarity in expression between the earlier and later translations. That we find a great deal strengthens our thesis. To this aspect of the study we shall now turn.

In the face of a linguistic development from Middle English into Modern, in the face of an accompanying advance in the art of translation, and in the face of a radical change in methods and sources of Scriptural translation and interpretation, we still see reflections of the early translators in our modern Psalter. 'My flesch sall rest in hope', says Rolle, 'for thou sall noght leue my saule in hell'; and the words in *A.* are almost exactly the same (Ps. 16. 9, 10). For this verse in *A.* (Ps. 105. 29), 'Hee turned their waters into blood. and slew their fish', we find in *R.*, 'He

turnyd thaire watirs in blode. and he sloghe thaire fysshis'. Here and in other verses that could be cited the wording and rhythm in *R.* correspond more closely to the modern version than they do in *W.* Clearly the translation of Rolle in these instances is the smoother and simpler, and the more memorable. In spite of the frequent inadequacies of his version, it still avoided some of the unlovely, stilted mannerisms of *W.* Following are a few examples showing significant similarities between *R.* and *A.*:

*R.*

1. 3. And he sall be as a tre that is sett bysyd the streemes of waters

1 7. For lord knew the way of rightwis. & the gate of wicked sall perisch.

2. 5. Than he sall spek till thaim in his wreth.

6. 8. Departis fra me all that wirkes wickidnes, for lord has hard the voice of my gretynge.

18 2. Day til day riftes worde; and nyght til nyght shewis conynge.

20. 4. He askid lif of the: and thou gaf til him lenghe of dayes, in world & in world of world.

23. 1. The erth is the lordis and fulnes of it; the world and all that wones thar in.

36. 20. Thai sall not be shamed in ill tyme

36. 42. And lord sall help thaim, and delyuere thaim, and he sall out take thaim fra synful, and he sall saf thaim, for thai hopid in him.

50. 16. Lord thou sall opyn my lippis, and my mouth sall shew thi louynge

59. 3. Thou shewid til thi folke harde thyngs. thou gafe vs drinke of the wine of compunction

59 5. That thine lufid be delverid: make sauf in thi righthand and here me.

96 8, 9. Syon herd and was fayn. And the doghtirs of iude gladid

102. 22 Blessis til lord alle his werkes: un ilke stid of his lordship blesse my soule til lord

104 34. And he smate all first borne in thaire land.

141. 7. I cryed til the lord; I sayde thou ert my hope, my poreyon in land of lifand.

*A.*

1. 3 And he shalbe like a tree planted by the riuers of water.

1. 6 For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous but the way of the vngodly shall perish.

2. 5. Then shall hee speake unto them in his wrath

6 8. Depart from me, all yee workers of iniquities, for the Lord hath heard the voice of my weeping.

19. 2 Day vnto day vttereth speach, and night vnto night sheweth knowledge.

21 4. He asked life of thee, and thou gauest it him, even length of dayes for euer and euer.

24. 1. The earth is the Lords, and the fulnesse thereof, the world, and they that dwell therein.

37. 19 They shall not be ashamed in the euill time

37. 40. And the Lord shall helpe them and deliuer them: he shall deliuer them from the wicked, and saue them because they trust in him.

51. 15. O Lord open thou my lips, and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise.

60. 3 Thou hast shewed thy people hard things. thou hast made vs to drinke the wine of astonishment.

60 5. That thy beloued may be deliuered; saue with thy right hand, and heare mee.

97. 8. Sion heard, and was glad, and the daughters of Iudah reioyced.

103 22 Blesse the Lord all his works in all places of his dominion. blesse the Lord, o my soule

105. 36 Hee smote also all the first borne in their land.

142. 5. I cried vnto thee, O Lord, I said, Thou art my refuge, and my portion in the land of the living.

The Wyclifite Psalter, in that it gives us a more complete and full English prose, in general shows greater similarity to the later versions

than does *R*. This is true despite the fact that *W.* has mannerisms which frequently destroy its smoothness and its rhythm. After one has become acquainted with the style of this Psalter, it is often possible, as one reads over its verses, to predict most of the changes in wording and rhythm that will appear in the corresponding verse of *A.* So it is with the following verse:

*W.*, 24 20. Kepe thou my soule, and  
delyuere thou me, be Y not aschamed,  
for Y hopide in thee.

*A.*, 25 20 O keepe my soule and  
deliuer me let me not bee ashamed, for I  
put my trust in thee.

The insertion of the subject 'thou' in *W.*, the use of 'be Y not' where *A.* has 'let me not bee', and 'hopide' for 'put my trust', are all very characteristic differences between the two versions. With such constant and, for the most part, minor variations in mind, we find the frequent and repeated agreements in the phraseology of the two Psalters most striking.

*W.*

1. 6. For the Lord knowith the weie of  
iust men, and the weie of wickid men  
schal perische.

3. 5. With my vois Y criede to the  
Lord, and he herde me fro his hool  
hil.

4. 3. Have thou mercy on me; and  
here thou my preier.

5. 11. Her throte is an opyn sepulcre,  
thei diden gileful with her tungis.

8. 5. What is a man, that thou art  
myndeuf of hym, ethur the sone of a  
virgyn, for thou visites him.

21. 7. But Y am a worm, and not man;  
the schenschip of men, and the out-  
castyng of the puple.

21. 17. For many doggis cumpassiden  
me; the counsel of wickid men besegide  
me. Thei delueden myn hondis and my  
feet.

22. 4. For whi thouz Y schal go in the  
myddis of schadwewe of deeth; Y schal  
not drede yuels, for thou art with me  
Thi zerde and thi staf; tho han coun-  
fortid me.

32. 18. Lo! the 13en of the Lord ben  
on men dredyng hym; and in hem that  
hopen on his merci.

33. 5. I souzt the Lord, and he herde  
me; and he delyuerde me fro alle my  
tribulaciouns.

34. 16. Thei gnastiden on me with her  
teeth.

35. 10. And in thi ligt we schulen se  
ligt.

*A.*

1. 6. For the Lord knoweth the way of  
the righteous: but the way of the vn-  
godly shall perish.

3. 4. I cryed vnto the Lord with my  
voyce, and he heard me out of his holy  
hill.

4. 1. Haue mercy vpon me, and heare  
my prayer.

5. 9. Their throat is an open sepulchre,  
they flatter with their tongue.

8. 4. What is man, that thou art mind-  
full of him? and the sonne of man, that  
thou visitest him.

22. 6. But I am a worme, and no man;  
a reproach of men, and despised of the  
people.

22. 16. For dogges haue compassed  
me: the assembly of the wicked haue  
inclosed me: they pierced my hands and  
my feete.

23. 4. Yea though I walke through the  
valley of the shadowe of death, I will  
feare no euill; for thou art with me, thy  
rod and thy staffe, they comfort me.

33. 18. Behold, the eye of the Lord is  
vpon them that feare him: vpon them  
that hope in his mercy.

34. 4. I sought the Lord, and hee  
heard me; and deliuered mee from all my  
feares.

35. 16. They gnashed vpon mee with  
their teeth

36. 9. In thy light shall we see light.

## W.

40 5. I seide, Lord, haue thou mercy on me. heele thou my soule, for Y synned azens thee.

44. 8. Thou louedist ryghtfulnesse, and hatidist wickidnesse, therefor thou, God, thi God, anoyntide thee with the oyle of gladnesse, more than thi felowis.

50 17. Lord, opene thou my lippis; and my mouth schal telle thi preysyng

70. 11. Seynge, God hath forsake hym, pursue ze, and take hym; for noon is that schal delyuere.

70 17 God, thou hast taught me fro my zongthe

71. 9 And hise enemyes schulen like the erthe.

72 26. Mi fleische and myn herte failde.

76. 20. Thi weie in the see, and thi pathis in many watris; and thi steppis schulen not be knowun

88. 15, 16. Mercy and treuthe schulen go bfore thi face, blessid is the puple that kan herth song

94. 3 For God is a greet Lord, and a greet king aboue alle goddis.

94. 5 For the see is his, and he made it; and hise hondis formeden the drie lond

106 20. He sente his word, and hee- lide hem, and delyuere hem fro the perischingis of hem.

106. 23. Thei that gon down in to the see in schippis

108. 3. Thei spaken azens me with a gileful tunge, and with wordis of hatere- dyn thai vmgafe me, and thai werid me of selfe will.

117. 26. Blessid is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. We blessedon gou of the hous of the Lord

118. 105. Thi word is a lanterne to my feet, and lizt to my pathis.

120. 6 The sunne schal not brenne thee bi dai; nether the moon bi nyzt.

123. 2, 3 Whanne men risiden vp azens vs, in had thei hadden swalewid vs quike.

123. 8 Oure helpe is in the name of the Lord; that made heuene and erthe.

## A.

41 4 I sayd, Lord be mercifull vnto me, heale my soule, for I haue sinned against thee

45 7. Thou louest righteousnesse, and hatest wickednesse. therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oyle of gladnesse aboue thy fellowes

51 15. O Lord open thou my lips, and my mouth shall shew foorth thy praise.

71 11. Saying, God hath forsaken him: persecute and take him, for there is none to deliuer him

71 17 O God, thou hast taught me from my youth.

72. 9 And his enemies shall like the dust

73. 26 My flesh and my heart faileth

77. 19. Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy foot- steps are not knownen.

89 14, 15. Mercie and trueth shall goe before thy face Blessed is the people that knowe the ioyfull sound

95. 3. For the Lord is a great God and a great king aboue all Gods

95 5 The sea is his, and he made it. and his hands formed the dry land.

107. 20. Hee sent his word, and healed them; and deliuered them from their destructions.

107. 23. They that goe downe to the sea in shippes.

109, 2, 3 They haue spoken against me with a lying tongue. They compassed mee about also with wordes of hatred: and fought against me without a cause.

118 26. Blessed be he that commeth in the Name of the Lord: wee haue blessed you out of the house of the Lord.

119. 105. Thy word is a lampe vnto my feete: and a light vnto my path

121. 6. The sunne shall not smite thee by day; nor the moone by night.

124 2, 3. When men rose vp against vs Then they had swallowed vs vp quicke.

124. 8 Our helpe is in the name of the Lord: who made heauen and earth.

There can be little doubt that the correspondence between the Middle English Psalters and the Psalms of the Authorised Version is more than accidental. In a few scattered verses, where both wording and idea are simple and conventional, such similarities could readily be passed off as

coincidental. But there may be found hundreds of passages like the above, in which the ideas are frequently not simple or conventional and the phraseology in the earlier and later versions is surprisingly similar. The weight of the material precludes accident or coincidence. It would seem that the translators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries approached their tasks already familiar with English Psalms

Miss Dorothy Everett, writing in these pages, has shown a connection between Rolle's English Psalter and the slightly earlier, or possibly contemporary, Middle English Metrical Psalter.<sup>1</sup> Further, she has found between the Metrical Version and one or another of the Old English glossed Psalters striking similarities, which she lists. It may well be that an English 'Psalter tradition' extends back even farther than the fourteenth century, into the Old English period. One of the continuous threads of English prose, connecting the time of Alfred with the time of Thomas More, may be the thread of English Biblical translation.

LAURENCE MUIR.

ALAMOSA, COLORADO, U.S.A

<sup>1</sup> 'The Middle English Prose Psalter of Richard Rolle of Hampole', in *Modern Language Review*, xvii (1922), 337-50

## CLAUDE FAUCHET'S MANUSCRIPTS

CLAUDE FAUCHET (1530-1601) may well be called France's first literary historian. His *Recueil de l'origine de la langue et poesie françoise* (1581), which contains articles on 127 poets living before 1300, is the first serious study of Old French literature, and it remained for a long time the source of other works of this nature, many of which merely repeat what Fauchet had already observed. In his works, Fauchet deals with epics, romances, *fabliaux*, lyric poetry, satiric and didactic literature, and chronicles and histories, and he obviously had at his disposal a large number of MSS. as well as printed books. Yet M. Simonnet<sup>1</sup> only mentions eleven extant MSS. which belonged or were known to Fauchet. Messrs Holmes and Radoff in an article on *Claude Fauchet and his library*<sup>2</sup> mention eighteen extant MSS. which were known to Fauchet, but this number should be seventeen, as they refer to a MS. at Stockholm by two numbers (V. u. 22 and Fr. LIII) without realising that it is one MS. and not two. In the course of researches on Fauchet's knowledge of Old French literature I have traced fifty-nine MSS. which Fauchet owned or borrowed. There are also in existence three MSS. in Fauchet's hand.

### I. THE MSS. IN FAUCHET'S HAND.

(1) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale. Fonds fr. No. 24726.

This is a paper MS. (formerly Saint-Victor 997) consisting of 131 sheets, 260 × 185 mm., bound in one volume. The writing throughout is Fauchet's. The fly-leaf is covered with drawings and inscriptions, amongst which is one concerning Fauchet's birth: 'Je naquis lan 1530 le 3 jour de juillet jour de dimanche entre 5 et 6 heures du matin, C. Fauchet.' Another records some books 'baillez a Msr. Vaillant, le 21 mars 1571'. On the back of this leaf is a table of the contents of the first fifteen folios, followed by the lines

Et sa vertu estoit encor plus gratieuse  
Compaigne d'un coeur corps et ame genereuse.  
Et sa vertu estoit encor plus estumee  
Pource que en beau corps on la voioit logee.

The first fifty-one folios are more neatly written than the rest and the

<sup>1</sup> G. Simonnet, 'Le président Fauchet, sa vie et ses œuvres', in *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, ix (Paris, 1863), p. 425. Also published separately (Paris, 1864).

<sup>2</sup> Urban Holmes and Maurice Radoff, 'Claude Fauchet and his library', in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XLIV, No. 1 (March, 1929), p. 229.

matter is divided into four books, each book being divided into chapters  
The following are the headings:

Fol. 1a: Veilles ou observations de plusieurs choses d'innées de memoire en la lecture<sup>1</sup> daucuns autheurs françois par C F P l'an 1555

Livre premier De l'utilité des histoires et que les memoires de Philippe de Commines telz que nous les avons sont imparfaits Chap. 1

Fol 2a: Des Autheurs du Romant d'Alexandre dont sont appelés les vers alexandrins premierement d'Alexandre de Paris dit de Bernai Chap 2

Fol. 3b: Que la ville antienement dite Lutece estoit bastie la ou maintenant est la cité de Paris et non a Melun Chap 3.

Fol 5a: Des deux Autheurs du Romant de la Rose, Guillaume de Lorris et Jehan de Mung Chap 4

Fol. 7a. Que signifie ce mot Pallefroi. Chap 5.

Fol. 7b: De Gaston surnommé Phebus, conte de Foix, auteur du Livre de la Chasse Chap. 6.

Fol 8b De Jehan Froissart historiographe Chap 7.

Fol 9b. Ordre que l'on tenoit au Duel (ou Gage de Bataille) en France durant le regne des Rois Charles cinquesme et sixiesme. Chap. 8

Fol. 15b contains a table of contents for the next fifteen folios

Fol 16a: Second livre des veilles ou observations en la lecture (ou leçon) de plusieurs Autheurs françois par C. F. P. 1555

Que antienement les vers rimez de noz poetes se chantoient au son des instrumentz Chap. 1

Fol 16b Aulcuns passages de Phillippe de Comines corruptus restituez. Chap 2

Fol 19a. Histoire memorable de six Francois qui s'exposerent volontairement a la mort pour sauver leurs citoiens assiegez Chap. 3

Fol. 21b L'estendue de nostre langue avoir esté plus grande qu'elle n'est maintenant. Chap 4

Fol. 24b. De l'estendart qui se plantoit au temps passé au melieu des batailles. Chap. 5.

Fol. 26a: Estimologie du mot sergent. Chap 6.

Fol. 26b: De Maistre Allan Chartier, poete et orateur françois. Chap. 7.

Fol. 27a: Du corfeu Chap 7. (*sic*)

Fol. 27b: De Gaces de la Vigne lequel a escript un Romans des Oiseaux et de leur chasse en vers françois. Chap 8.

Fol. 30b contains a table of contents for the next fifteen folios.

Fol. 31a: Troiesme livre des veilles ou observations en la lecture de plusieurs auteurs françois, par C F. P. 1555.

Des contes et de l'origine de leurs dignitez. Chap. 1.

Fol 32b: Pourquoi Phillippe duc de Bourgogne fut surnommé le hardi. Chap. 2.

Fol 33a: D'un ingénieur du pais de Genesve qui fit a Paris pareilles souplesses a l'entree de Isabel femme du roi Charles 8 que le Turc a celle du roi Henri 2 Chap. 3.

Fol. 33b: Ethimologie et origine de ce mot malletottes. Chap 4.

Fol. 34b: Anglois appelez couez et pourquoi. Chap 5.

Des marquys Chap. 6.

Fol. 35a: Du conestable et de son etimologie. Chap 7

Fol 37a: De Clement Marot. Chap. 8.

Fol. 39b: De Pierre de Ronsard poete Chap 9.

Fol. 42a: De Jehan le Maire Poete et historiographe Chap. 10.

Fol 44a: Histoire memorable touchée en passant par M. Georges Chastellans d'ung jeune homme de 20 ans sachant toutes sciences, declarée plus amplement Chap. 11.

Fol. 45b contains a table of the contents of the next five folios.

Fol. 46a: Quatriesme livre de veilles ou observations de choses dignes de memoire en la lecture de plusieurs auteurs françois, par C. F. P.

<sup>1</sup> In the margin: 'ou leçon'.

- Huon de Meri auteur du tournoiment d'antecrist  
 Fol. 47a De Hugues de Bersi auteur d'un livre intitulé la Bible. Chap. 2.  
 Fol. 50b Que cest que blancs murs de Paris Cap 3

This chapter ends on fol. 51a, which is the last numbered by Fauchet. The next fifty-eight folios are filled with notes on various subjects, many being explanations of Latin texts. Amongst them occur notes on Old French literature as follows.

- Fol. 53a-53b: Du Romant d'Alexandre au livre du cousin Gotron.  
 Fol. 53b Langue romande et roman  
 Fol. 66a D'uns romans appellé Guion de Nanteuil  
 Fol. 66a-68a. Du Roman Renaut de Montauban.  
 Fol. 68a-69b. D'un autre Roman que je pense estre de Doon de Nanteuil.  
 Fol. 69b-70a. Du Romans Aien d'Avignon et Garnier de Nanteuil  
 Fol. 70b-71a Romans de Guot fils d'Aie d'Avignon et de Garnier  
 Fol. 71a-72b Romans de Raol de Cambrais  
 Fol. 74a-74b. Que signifie ce mot ferrant.  
 Fol. 77a-79a. Coustumes extraites de Siperis.  
 Fol. 104a-105a. De deux livres appartenans l'un a M. Henry de Mesmes, maistre des requestes, & M. Pasquier advocat Cest un Recueil de plusieurs vieilles chansons dont les premiers coupletz sont notez A la fin toutes les chansons sont notees.  
 Fol. 105b: De Blondiaux.  
 Fol. 109a: (inc.) Xien de Troies a composé ung Roman C'est li contes des Graal.  
 Fol. 109b is blank. The rest of the MS. contains notes on historical subjects, genealogies, etc.

The extracts from Doon de Nanteuil which Fauchet gives on fol. 68a-69b were published by P. Meyer in *Romana*, XIII (Paris, 1884)

(2) Rome, Vatican MS. Reg. 734.

Besides the dissertations published by E. Langlois,<sup>1</sup> this MS contains (fol. 88-93) notes in Fauchet's hand relative to the history of Anjou, including ninety-four lines of a poem in honour of certain relics kept at Charroux.<sup>2</sup> On fol. 108-9 is a fragment of an *Advis sur la publication du concile de Trente*, also in Fauchet's hand.

(3) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale. Fonds fr No. 20152 (fol. 307).

This is a letter from Fauchet to M. de Nevers. The heading is in a different hand on a slip of paper pasted across the head of the letter. As it has not hitherto been published I give the text in full:

Lettre du President Fauchet a Mr de Nevers 7 Aoust 1587

Monseigneur Hier le Secretaire Marchant me dit que desiriez vous esclairer de moi que signifie Arriereban. Vous me faites beaucoup dhonneur dauoir telle fiance de mon scauoir mais jai peur que vostre bonté ne presume trop de ma suffisance. Toute fois (au hazard de toute telle quelle peult estre & a la charge que la presente sera jetee au feu si ung aultre dit mieux ou moi mesme dans quelz temps trouue plus de certitude) je vous dirai ce que soubdain jai trouvé.

<sup>1</sup> E. Langlois, 'Quelques dissertations inédites de Claude Fauchet', in *Études Romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris* (Paris, 1891), p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> These lines are given in full in the description of this MS. in *Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques*, XXXIII, ii (Paris, 1869), pp. 37-41.



Ban signifie Mandement publication & cri. Cap 6. Caroli magni Xtn (?) 21. Vt nullus ad placitum banniatu nisi qui causam suam querere debet la ou Banniatu signifie soit Appellé & vous scauez quen langue Italiene Bando signifie publication. Apel. convocation Arriereban est ce qui reste apres le Ban. Ainsi l'entend vng qui a fait vng lure intitulé Besterie lequel viuoit il y a plus de 300 ans Il dit Car ainsi comme .I. Roix quand il vait guerrier hors de son Roiaulme il emmoine de ses meilleurs hommes vne partie & si en laisse encores graigneur partie en se terre garder Mais quand il voit ke il ne puet souffire a tant de gens comme il a amenez avec soi si parmande tous chiaux quil a laissez & fait son arriereban. Ainsi me convient &c ou (?) chist derrain escrit

Ainsi Arriereban se peult prendre pour conuocation des Arrierefielz comme si le Roi par le Ban entendoit seulement ses Wassaulx de plain fief & par l'Arriereban les Wassaulx des Wassaulx A celle fin que les Wassaulx du Roi par le Ban simple naient excuse silz ne maient leurs Wassaulx comme y aiant Ban simple Et les Wassaulx des Wassaulx ne soient exemptez dacompaigner leurs seigneurs puis que le Roi les semond par l'arriereban

Toute fois je doute si le mot Arriereban Vient point de Arribannum ou Heribannum motz qui se trouuent es vielles histoires & loix Francoises qui signifioit conuocation ou amende pour nauoir nauoir (*sic*) este a la guerre Au Cap. 6 Versic 72 Si quis liber contempta iussione nostra Ceteris In exercitum pergentibz domi residere presumpserit plenum Arribannum secundum legem francorum solidorum 60<sup>ta</sup> sciat se debere componere Au meisme Chap fol 77 Vf Harribannum aut aliquod collectum & exercitali causa. &c

Et le mot Here signifioit aussi en viel langage Ost Armee. Camp Ainsi Heribannum signifioit conuocation pour Ost. ou apel pour aller a la guerre. Mais il faudroit plus de temps pour discourir de l'origine conduite & maniere de leuer l'arriereban Institution des hommes darmes francois et aultre militie de ce Roiaulme Ce pendant

MSeigneur je me recommande (?) humblement a vos bonnes graces et prie dieu vous tenir en la siene presentement ce 7. aoust 1587. Vostre treshumble & affectionne seruiteur Claude Fauchet.

## II. MSS. BELONGING OR KNOWN TO FAUCHET.

### A. Extant MSS.

Most of the MSS. in the following list bear some indication that they belonged to Fauchet; but as my purpose is not to reconstruct his library, but rather to trace and show the extent of his knowledge of Old French literature, I have included MSS. which bear notes in his hand, but which he may possibly only have borrowed. After the number of each MS. I have indicated the works contained in it to which Fauchet refers, either in his published works or manuscript notes In the case of a few MSS. he has not mentioned any of the contents at all in his writings.

PARIS, Bibliothèque nationale:

Fonds latins, 270, 3854, 4728 and 8070

Fonds français.

124. *Pseudo-Turpin*.

401. (Fauchet wrote: 'C'est a monsieur le fevre precepteur de monseigneur le prince de Condé qui me la... (*a word illegible, possibly presté*)... 21 decembre 1600 C. Fauchet.') )

674. ('Qui m'a esté donné par monsieur Arauld (?) lieutenant criminel d'Angers le 27 octobre 1592 a Angers. C. Fauchet.')

699. *Chronique universelle* by Jehan de Courcy.

700. *Compilations* by Jehan de Courcy.

765 (A note by Fauchet on this MS. mentions another *chansonnier* he had seen belonging to M. de Mesmes.)

786 *Le Chevalier au Cygne. La Conqueste de Jerusalem. Le Roman d'Alexandre*

789. (This is the MS. wrongly referred to by Holmes and Radoff as 7190 It was formerly 7190<sup>4</sup> and consists of two MSS bound together. The second only, containing *Judas Machabee*, belonged to Fauchet.)

837. *Fabliaux. Bible* by Hugues de Berzé. *A.B.C.* by Huon le roi de Cambrai *Chatonet* by Jehan du Chastelet. *Songe d'Enfer* by Raoul de Houdenc *Jeu de la Feuillee* by Adam de la Hale. *Crieries de Paris* by Guillaume de la Villeneuve. *Honte et Puterie* by Richard de Lille Works of Rutebeuf. *Dit de Fortune*.

859. *Auberi le Bourgoing*.

1442. *Garin le Lorrain*.

1454 Wace's *Brut*.

1560. (Bought by Fauchet in 1570.) *Roman de la Rose*.

1568. (Acquired by Fauchet in 1596.) *Roman de la Rose*.

1593. (Acquired by Fauchet from M. de Roissi in exchange for a French Chronicle.) *Fabliaux Art d'Amors* by Guiart. *Vers de la Mort* by Helinand *Antichrist* by Huon de Méry. *Renart le nouvel* by Jaquemart Gielee *Evangile aux femmes* by Jehan du Pin. *Pour orgueilleux humilier. Songe d'Enfer* by Raoul de Houdenc. *Contempt du Monde* by Renault d'Audon. *Fables* by Marie de France. Works of Rutebeuf *Jugement d'Amour. Le Bachelier d'Armes. L'outillage au vilain*.

1621. (Acquired by Fauchet in 1596.) *Chevalier au Cygne. Conqueste de Jerusalem. Pseudo-Turpin*.

1637. *Ciperis de Vigneaux*.

1645. *Pèlerinage de la vie humaine* by Guillaume de Deguilleville.

2140. *Roman de Fauvel*.

2233. *Aiquin*.

5003. *Récit d'un ménestrel de Reims*.

24365. *Roman d'Alexandre. Vengeance Alexandre* by Jehan li Nevelois.

24428. *Image du Monde* by Gossuin. *Volucraire* by Omont. (Fauchet took these two works, which follow one another in the MS., as one—the *Image du monde*, which he ascribes to Omont.) *Fables* by Marie de France.

25405. *Bible* by Guiot de Provins *Bible* by Hugues de Berzé. *L'Estoire li Romans de Monseignor Thebault de Maill.* *Fables* by Marie de France. *Romans de Carité* by Renclus de Moihens.

25408.

25462. (This is presumably the MS. referred to by Holmes and Radoff as N.D. côte 14, No. 7. It was formerly Notre Dame M. 7.) *L'ordene de chevalerie* *Romans de Carité* by Renclus de Moihens.

25545. *Fabliaux* *La Descriptions des Rehgions* by Huon le Roi de Cambrai. *Fables* by Marie de France *Romans de Carité* by Renclus de Moihens. *Bestiare d'Amours* by Richard de Fournival.

ROME, Vatican.

Reg. 610 *Chronique des Francs.*

Reg. 753. *Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris.*

Reg. 767. *Miroir historial.*

Reg. 791. *Chronique de Normandie.*

Reg. 811. *Chronique.*

Reg. 936. *Chronique de Normandie* by Guillaume de Jumièges. *Pseudo-Turpin.*

Reg. 967. *Chronique de Hainaut.*

Reg. 1211.

Reg. 1350. (Acquired by Fauchet in 1596.)

Reg. 1490. *Jeu de la Feuillee* by Adam de la Hale.

Reg. 1501.

Reg. 1522. (Fauchet says in his *Recueil* that he borrowed this MS. from M. Matherel, but on the first folio is written 'C'est a moi Fauchet'. Possibly he found the MS. so interesting that he bought it later.) *Roman de la Rose*. 66 *jeux-partis*. *Tornoiment as dames de Paris* by Pierre Gencien.

Reg. 1683. *Codicille de Jehan de Meung.*

Reg. 1684.

Reg. 1687. *Roman de Graal*. (Prose version of Robert de Boron's work.)

Reg. 1699. ('Achepté le 26 aoust 1594, 40 souls. C. Fauchet'. This is the only MS. on which Fauchet has recorded the price he paid for it.)

Reg. 1725. *Lancelot*. *Meraugis de Portlesgues*. *Guillaume de Dôle*. (This MS. also contains *Yvain* but the quotations from it which Fauchet gives were taken from another MS.)

Ottob. 3064. *Fables* by Marie de France.

STOCKHOLM <sup>1</sup>

D. 1311 (Brit. III.) (Acquired by Fauchet in 1596) *Chronique anglo-normande*.

D. 1281 (Fr. VIII.) *Chronique des ducs d'Orléans*.

M. 305 (Fr. XXXVIII.)

V u. 14 (Fr. XLIV.)

V. u. 16 (Fr. XLVI.)

V. u. 22 (Fr. LIII) (Holmes and Radoff refer to V. u. 22 and Fr. LIII as if they were two MSS. instead of one.) *Antichrist* by Huon de Méry.  
(Fr. LIV)

## BERLIN, Konigl. Bibl.

Gall. qu. 48. (This MS. was formerly at Rome, Vatican Reg. 1361.) *Meraugis de Portlesgues*. *Antichrist* by Huon de Méry.

## LONDON, British Museum.

Addit. 15606. *Bible* by Hugues de Berzé.

## UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN.

Is. Vossii codex Latinus oct. No. 60. (This is a MS. which Fauchet borrowed from M. Pithou.) *Chanson de Sainte Foi d'Agen*.

## B. MSS which are no longer extant.

Fauchet mentions the following MSS. which are believed to be no longer extant:

(1) A MS. containing *Renaut de Montauban*, *Doon de Nanteuil*, *Aye d'Avignon* and *Gui de Nanteuil*. These were originally separate MSS., but when Fauchet saw them they were sewn together. He tells us that the MS was incomplete; in particular the first sheet of each work, which was illuminated, had been damaged. Fauchet copied 196 lines from *Renaut de Montauban* (eighteen of which are not to be found in Castets' edition<sup>2</sup>), seventy-six lines from *Aye d'Avignon* (thirty-seven of which do not occur in the known MSS.) and 108 lines from *Gui de Nanteuil* (twenty of which do not occur in the known MSS.). The lines from *Doon de Nanteuil*, of which no MS. exists, have been published by P. Meyer.<sup>3</sup>

(2) A MS. of *Ciperis de Vigneaux*, besides B.N. 1637, since he says he saw two MSS. of it, 'rompuës au commencement, au milieu & a la fin'.

<sup>1</sup> The numbers in brackets are those given in G. Stephens, *Förteckning öfver de förnamsta Brittiska och Fransyska Handskrifterna uti Kongl. Bibliotheket i Stockholm* (Stockholm, 1847).

<sup>2</sup> F. Castets, 'Les quatre fils Aymon', in *Revue des langues romanes*, XLIX-LI (Montpellier, 1906-8).

<sup>3</sup> See above.

(3) A MS. containing the works of Crestien de Troyes. Fauchet saw this in a printer's shop, being used by the printers to fill their 'sticks', and, fearing that the rest of the MS. was lost, he copied out what remained. The lines which he gives are from *Perceval* and *Yvain*.

(4) A MS. which he borrowed from Pasquier containing the *Bible de Guot de Provins* and the *Bible de Hugues de Berzé*<sup>1</sup>

(5) Another MS. containing the *Bible de Hugues de Berzé* which he saw in the 'bibliotheque du roi'.

(6) A *chansonner*, borrowed from M. Henri de Mesmes, seigneur de Roissy. From the description of this *chansonner* given in Fauchet's MS notes, and the references to it in the *Recueil*, I have been able to reconstruct its contents to a certain extent, as follows:<sup>2</sup>

Fol. 1a,<sup>3</sup> Thibaut de Champagne (10 chansons):

1. Quant fine amour me prie que je chant (306)
2. Feuille ne flour ne vaut riens en chantant (324).
3. Dame, l'on dit que l'on muert bien de joie (1727).
4. Je n'os chanter trop tart ne trop souvent (733).
5. Coustume est bien quant on tient un prison (1880).
6. De bone amour vient science et bonté (407)
7. Je (Bien) me cuidois partir (1440).
8. Qui plus (bien) aime, plus endure (2095)
9. Tuit mi desir et tuit mi grief tourment (741).
10. Tant ai amours servies longuement (711).

Fol 6a, Gace Brulé (49 chansons):

1. Au renouveau de la douleur d'esté (437).
2. Cil qui d'amour me conseille (565)
5. D'amours qui m'a tolu a moi (1664).
8. J'ay oublé poine et travaux (389).

Fol 29b, Chastelain de Coucy (15 or more chansons):

1. Ah, amours tant dure departie (1125).
2. Commencement de douce saison bele (590).
3. Li nouviaus tans et mais et violete (986).
4. Mout m'est bele la douce començance (209).
15. A vous amant, plus qu'a nul autre gent (679)

Fol. 38b, Blondel de Nesle (12 chansons):

1. Quant je plus sui en paor de ma vie (1227).
3. Bien doit chanter cui fine amour adrece (482).
6. J'ain par coustume et par us (2124).
8. Chanter m'estuet, car joie ai recouvrée (551).
10. Se savoient mon tourment (742).

<sup>1</sup> The lines which Fauchet gives as beginning the *Bible de Hugues de Berzé* in this and the following MS. are in reality the first lines of *L'Armeure du Chevalier*, but those quoted as coming from the end belong to the *Bible*. The two works seem to have been confused.

<sup>2</sup> I have given the first line of each chanson mentioned by Fauchet, with (in brackets) the number of it in G. Raynaud, *Bibliographie des Chansonniers français des XIII<sup>e</sup> et XIV<sup>e</sup> siècles* (Paris, 1884).

<sup>3</sup> This was not originally the beginning of the MS. Fauchet noted that the first two pages appeared to have been cut off.

Fol. 44b, Perrin d'Angicourt (27 or more chansons)

1. Quant li cincejus s'ecrie (1148).<sup>1</sup>
11. Quant voi le felon tans finé (460)
15. Amours dont sens et courtoisie (1118).
17. Onques pour esloignement (672).
22. Quant partis sui en Provence (625).

Fol. 57a, Thierry de Soissons (9 or more chansons):

1. A la plus saige et a la melz vaillant (363)
9. Se j'ai lonc tans esté en Romanie (1204)

Fol. 65a, Thibaut de Blaison (5 chansons).

1. Bien voi que ne puis morir (1433)

Fol. 67a, Gautier de Dargies (8 chansons)

1. Bien font amours lor talent (738)
6. Or chant novel car longuement (708).

Fol. 71a, Jehan Moniot d'Arras (6 or more chansons)

1. Li douz termines m'agrée (490).
6. Amours n'est pas que c'on die (1135).

Fol. 74b, Gillebert de Berneville (13 or more chansons):

1. Haute chose a en amour (1954).

Fol. 80b, Richart de Semilli (4 or more chansons):

1. L'autrier chevauchie delez Paris (1583).

Fol. 83b, Vidame de Chartres (4 chansons)

1. Tant ai d'amour qu'en chantant m'estuet plaindre (130).
2. Quant la saison du dous tans s'asseure (2086).

Fol. 85b, Robert de Blois (4 chansons):

1. Tant com je fusse fors de ma contree (502).

Fol. 87, Raoul de Ferrieres (4 chansons):

1. Une haute amour qui esprent (673)

Fol. 89, Robert de Reims (3 or more chansons):

1. Bien s'est amours honnie (1163).
3. Qui bien veut amour descrire (1655).

Fol. 91b, Jehan Moniot de Paris (9 chansons):

1. Au nouviau tems que nest la violette (987).

Fol. 96b, Oede de la Couroirne (5 chansons):

1. Trop ai longuement fet grant consivrance (210).

Fol. 99b, Jehan Erars (? chansons)

1. Dehors lonc pré el bosquet (570).

Fol. 101b, Raoul de Beauvais (? chansons):

1. Delez un pré verdoyant (368)
- ? Remembrance de bone amour (1943)

Fol. 103b, Gautier d'Espinous (5 or more chansons).

1. Quant voi yver et froideur apparoir (1784)
2. Tout autresi comme l'aimant deçoit (1840).

<sup>1</sup> This is given in Fauchet's notes as the first line of the first chanson, but in the *Recueil* he says that the first contained a reference to a lady living in Paris. This one does not, but that beginning 'James ne cuidai avoir' (1786), attributed to Perrin, does.

- Fol. 106 b, Jaques d'Espinois (1 chanson).  
 Au commencer de ma nouvel amour (1960).
- Fol. 107 a, Jaques de Cysoing (3 or more chansons)  
 1. Quant la saison est passée.
- Fol. 109 a, Gontier de Soignies (? chansons)  
 1. Au tems gens que raverdoie (1573)
- Fol. ? , Simon d'Anthie (2 chansons)
- Fol. 110 b, Richard de Fournival (? chansons).  
 1 Chacuns qui de bien amer (759).
- Fol. 112 a, Viellars de Corbie (? chansons).  
 1. De chanter me semont amours (2030)
- Fol. 113 b, Oudart de Lacenie (2 chansons)  
 1. Flor qui s'espanit et fueille qui verdoie (1766).
- Fol. 114 b, Baude de la Carriere (1 chanson):  
 Chanter m'estuet et si ne scai (103).
- Fol. 115 b, Trésorier de Lille (1 chanson).  
 Haut honeur d'un comendement (652).
- Fol. 116 a, Gilles de Viez-Maisons (2 chansons):  
 1. J'ai tant avant blasmé, puis voil blasmer (769).
- Fol. 117 a, Bruniaus de Tours (? chansons):  
 1. Ha' quand soupirs me viennent nuit et jour (1994).
- Fol. 118 b, Colin Muset (2 chansons):  
 1. Sire quens j'ai vielé (476).
- Fol. 119 b, Jaques de Hedinc (2 chansons):  
 1. Je chant comme devez (922).
- Fol. 120 b, Duc de Brabant (2 chansons):  
 1. Beau Gillebert dites s'il vous agrée (491).
- Fol. 121 b, Colar le Bouteiller (? chansons):  
 1. Je n'ai pas droite ochoison (1875).
- Fol. 124 a, Jehan l'Orgueneur (1 chanson):  
 Au tems que voy la fraidure (2104).
- Fol. 124 b, Gilles le Vinier (1 chanson):  
 Aler m'estuet la ou je trairai paine (140).
- Fol. 125 a, Pierre de Craon (? chansons):  
 1. Fine amor clam en moi par eritage (26).
- Fol. 126 a, Chanoine de Saint-Quentin (1 chanson):  
 Rose ne flor chant d'oiseaux ne verdure (2122).
- Fol. 126 b, Baudoun des Autels (1 chanson):  
 Ame et mon cors doigts a ceci (1033).
- Fol. 127 a, Chardon (1 chanson):  
 Li departis de la douce contrée (499).

- Fol. 127 b, Sauvage d'Arras (1 chanson):  
Quant li tems pert sa cholor (1969)
- Fol. 128 a, Robert de Marberolles (1 chanson).  
Chanter m'estuet car pris m'en est corage (15).
- Fol. 128 b, Philippe Pa (1 chanson).  
Se felon et lozangier (1286).
- Fol. 129 a, Hugues de Berzé (2 chansons)  
1. Nus homs ne set d'amī qu'il puet valeir (1821).
- Fol. 130 a, Roger de Cambrai (1 chanson):  
Nouvel amour qui si m'agrée (489).
- Fol. 130 b, Jehan de Maisons (1 chanson):  
Je ne cuit pas qu'en amor traison (1902).
- Fol. 131 a, Quens de la marche (1 chanson)  
Bernart a vous vueil demander (840).
- Fol. 131 b, Robert du Castel (2 chansons):  
1. Se j'ai chanté sans guerredon avoir (1789).
- Fol. 132 a, Lambert Ferris (? chansons)  
1. Amours qui m'a du tout en sa baillie (1110).
- Fol. 133 a, Jehan le Cuvelier (1 chanson):  
Pour la meillor qu'onques formast nature (2108).
- Fol. 133 b, Jehan Erars (1 chanson):  
Je ne cuidai mes chanter (823).
- Fol. 134 a, Eustache li Peintre (5 or more chansons).  
1. Cil qui chantent de flor ni de verdure (2116).
- Fol. 137 b, Jehan Erars (1 chanson):  
Je ne me scai mes en quel guise (1627)
- Fol. 138 a, Mahieu de Gand (2 chansons):  
1. Mahieu jugez se une dame amoie (1687).
- Fol. 139 a, Robert de Mauvoisin (1 chanson).  
Qui d'amours a remembrance (244).
- Fol. 139 b, Thomas Erars (1 chanson):  
Onc ne sorent mon penser (467).
- Fol. 140 a, Robert du Castel (1 chanson).  
Amours qui mult me guerroe (1722).
- Fol. 140 b, Lambert Ferris (1 chanson):  
Li tres dous tems ne la seson nouvelle (604).
- Fol. 141 a, Car Ausaux d'Arras (1 chanson):  
Puis que j'ai chanson neuve (2068)
- Fol. 141 b, Jehan Erars (1 chanson):  
Bone amour qui son repere (180).
- Fol. 142 a, Gontier de Soignes (1 chanson):  
El mors d'esté que li tems rassoage (34).



- Fol 142b, Aubouin de Sezanne (1 chanson)  
Long tems ay esté (433).
- Fol 143a, Jehan Frumiaux de Lille (1 chanson)  
Ma bonne foi et ma loial pensée (544)
- Fol 143b, Guillaume Viaux (1 chanson)  
J'ay aimé tretout mon vivant (371).
- Fol. 144a, Mahieu de Gand (1 chanson)  
Onques de chant en ma vie (1228).
- Fol. 144b, Vilain d'Arras (1 chanson)  
Se de chanter ne peusse humlement tenir (1473)
- Fol. 145a, Car Ausaux (1 chanson).  
Fine amours m'envoie (1716)
- Fol. 145b, Thomas Eriers (1 chanson).  
Bien me sus aperçus (2125).
- Fol. 146a, Quens d'Anjou (1 chanson).  
Trop est destroz qui est desconforté (423).
- Fol 146b, Roger d'Andeh (? chansons)  
1. Ja pour ce se d'amer me deul (997).
- Fol. 147b, Jehan le Cuveher (1 chanson).  
Je me plains que nul ne puet chanter.
- Fol 148a, Robert du Castel (1 chanson).  
En loial amours ai mis (1568).
- Fol. 148b, Quens de la Marche (10 or more chansons):  
1. Pus que d'Amour m'estuet les maux souffrir (1462)
- Fol. 154a, 'Commencent chansons qui ne nomment les autheurs'  
1 Pour moi renvoisier (1301).
- Fol. 209a, 'Cy commencent les Chansons de la mere dieu'.  
Chanter m'estuet et puis . . dex madonne.
- Fol 233a, 'Li lais de Guingamel':  
Au temps luisant Que la fleur. . .
- Fol 235a, 'La lus (*sic* Fauchet) de Lestournel':  
Quant voi le dous tems venir du mois d'avril et de mai
- Fol. 240a, 'La lus Damours':  
Amors qui m'a surpris Me semont de chanter
- Fol. 242a, 'La lais de la pastourelle':  
L'autrner chevaulchoit pensif par ung matin.
- Fol. 244a, 'La lais des Hermins':  
Long tems m'ai teu et encor me terroie
- Fol. 246a, 'L'estampie':  
J'ai trouvé et prouvé mon cuer plus enamouré.
- Fol. 247a, 'Cy commencent li motet enté':  
El mois d'avril qu'yver va departant.

Besides these six MSS, which Fauchet definitely mentions, other MSS. which he possessed or knew must have perished. These contained the following works from which he quotes lines which either vary considerably from those of the known MSS. or do not occur in them at all: *Raoul de Cambrai*, *Roman d'Alexandre*, *Roman d'Alexandre par le clerc Simon*, *Roman de Troie*, *Dolopathos*. Fauchet also quotes one line of an epic poem *Gerard d'Euphrate* (*Gerar du Frate*) which is no longer extant.

Fauchet may have known other extant MSS. besides the fifty-nine which I have listed above. In the case of some works which he mentions I have not been able to examine all the extant MSS. In other cases none of the extant MSS. shows any sign of having been in his possession; but the mere absence of his name, or of notes in his writing, on all the MSS. of a work which he mentions is not a sufficient ground for stating definitely that he knew the work in a MS. which is lost, unless he quotes passages differing from those of the known MSS. The list below is of those Old French works mentioned by Fauchet, of which I have traced no MSS. belonging or known to him. It is possible that he saw some of them in printed books; one or two, of which he makes but the barest mention, I suspect he only knew from hearsay.

*Berte as grans pies*, *Chanson de Roland*, *Girard de Roussillon*, *Cleomadés*, *Mehacin*, *Deduz de la Chasse* (Gace de la Buigne), *Livre de la Chasse* (Gaston Phebus), *Chronique de Bourgogne*, *Chronique de Bretagne*, *Chroniques de Flandre*, *Chronique de Reims*, *Li congré* (Jehan Bodel), *Li comment d'Amours* and *Puissance d'Amours* (Richard de Fournival), *Roman du chevalier des dames*, *Songe du Verger*, *Dit de la mort de l'Empereur Henry*, *Vie de Sainte-Christine*, *Roman de Tristan de Leonnois* (in prose) and a *Roman des faitz d'Alexandre*.

S. W. BISSON.

LEEDS.

## GOTTFRIED KELLER'S 'PANKRAZ DER SCHMOLLER'

THE first story in Gottfried Keller's *Die Leute von Seldwyla* has hitherto not attracted any particular attention. Even Ermatinger, in his biography of Keller,<sup>1</sup> contents himself with pointing out the autobiographical elements of the story. The relation between Pankraz and the author and hero of *Der Grune Heinrich* is obvious; obvious, too, is the influence of Keller's mother and his sister Regula and also of Betty Tendering.

But the interest of the story does not end with its autobiographical elements. A closer investigation will show that *Pankraz der Schmoller* is more instructive than even the more obviously didactic story of *Frau Regel Amrain und ihr Jungster*. The educational methods of Frau Regula are brought out into the open, every step is carefully prepared and fully discussed, and they have therefore found ready appreciation amongst scholars and educationists. But the way Pankraz has to go to become a man is far more obscure, and when investigated throws a new light on the character of the author.

From the beginning Pankraz is shown as a sulky boy. Of the small child and how he became sulky we are told nothing. When the story begins he is fourteen years of age and already strongly defined as a character. Yet it is important that most of his characteristics change only slightly as he grows up, whereas the main one which is the real cause of all that happens to him is treated from the beginning as a characteristic that ought to be outgrown. The whole story therefore is the story of a youth; and although he becomes a soldier in India and even a colonel in Algiers it is only the experience with the lion which ends the development of a boy and produces the man. *Pankraz der Schmoller*, therefore, like *Der Grune Heinrich*, deals with an unusually lengthy adolescence. And it is in adolescence that we will have to look for the reason of this sulkiness. In *Der Grune Heinrich* it is called 'Das Schmollen jenes Alters'.<sup>2</sup>

How does this sulkiness show itself? It is the retreat of the individual

<sup>1</sup> Emil Ermatinger, *G. Kellers Leben*, 6.-7. Auflage (Stuttgart, 1924), quoted as Ermatinger, *Leben*.

<sup>2</sup> G. Keller, *Sämtliche Werke*, hrsg. v. J. Frankel, IV (Erlenbach-Zürich, 1926), p. 100, quoted as *Werke*, IV.

before demands which he is not willing to fulfil. The sulky boy is ready rather to forgo great possibilities of action than fit himself into a world which does not correspond to his wishes. Pankraz rather throws down the spoon and does without his mashed potatoes than, by accepting an unjust share of them, accept a world that is not regulated according to his ideas. He would rather run away from home and food altogether than fit into a scheme of things which he cannot completely dominate.

To this resignation out of sheer spite another main characteristic is added which at first seems to have little connexion with it—that is, his imagination. But it is precisely this second characteristic that gives the key to the whole situation. The boy who stands on a hill and stares for hours at sunsets, builds up a world of his own within himself; or rather, he strengthens this world, for what appears to us to be imagination is reality to the child.<sup>1</sup>

This is in general the character of boys before puberty, and it fits in very well with Pankraz' age of fourteen years at the beginning of the story. The poignant conflict of puberty is this that the man has to destroy the world which the boy has built up from ideals, and instead of creating a world as it ought to be, has willingly to accept the world as it is. E. Spranger<sup>2</sup> points out that the breakdown of the old world through the discovery of a new side of it, the sexual side, is a catastrophe which cannot be overstressed. But exactly where the necessary readiness to destroy is lacking, sulkiness as a fundamental characteristic is brought out as an essentially 'useless' method developing into a technique of avoiding the demands of life.

This origin of sulkiness in the conflict of the individual with the world was first noted by Joachim Müller,<sup>3</sup> who remarks that it leads to arbitrariness, separation, and isolation until life is nothing but a dream, a day-dream which takes the place of action. Müller further points out that this conflict is essential to the characters in Adalbert Stifter's stories and that its origin is in the Romantic Movement. But the resignation which Stifter illustrates and recommends in his stories is not the real solution of this conflict between the self and the world; this resignation only leads to the sterility of the 'Hagestolz' and is rightly compared to the barren fig tree. It is always a withdrawal from life, even when, after the catastrophe, the years are spent in charitable work, as is the case of the doctor in *Die Mappe meines Urgrossvaters*. This charitable work

<sup>1</sup> E. Spranger, *Psychologie des Jugendalters*, 4. Auflage (Leipzig, 1925), p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.* pp. 112–13.

<sup>3</sup> Joachim Müller, *Vergleichende Studien zur Menschenauffassung und Menschendarstellung G. Kellers und A. Stifters*. Leipziger Dissertation (Weida, 1930).

is only a pretence of activity and fundamentally, i e., for the hero himself, futile and 'useless'.

In a similar way the imaginative life of young Pankraz, the flight into day-dreams, originates in this conflict. The discord between the self and the world leads to baroque dreams. The habit of seeing everything in relation to oneself ('Ichbezüglichkeit'), of which sulkiness and complaining are only symptoms, results in a blind belief in the day-dreams which are wish-fulfilments, and eventually endangers the whole life of the hero as he himself confesses 'Endlich aber drohete meine ganze Existenz, sich in müssige Traumseligkeit aufzulösen ...'<sup>1</sup> This kind of life within the imagination is useless, just like the day-dreams of the 'grüne Heinrich', as it does not widen the circle of life but stands aside and loses itself. The self continues to make a substitute for life at a time when its duty is already to accept its share in the real world. Imagination can go even a step further in this direction the 'Lugengeschichten' of Heinrich<sup>2</sup> and the make-believe world of the boy Goethe<sup>3</sup> are efforts to impress this purely imaginative world of one's own on other people.

But already the dawning manhood in Pankraz demands action and suffering. This he cannot find as he refuses to fit himself into the world and give up the self, since all action requires the surrender of the claim of exclusiveness. Therefore Pankraz has to look for action on the useless side of life; he finds it in hunting up a bitter injustice which has been done to him and which enables him to start a fight. This is an action which fulfils the desire of the boy and yet does not commit him. For in hunting up an injustice he saves himself the first, important step, his activity does not 'really' start with himself, it is not so much action as reaction. This non-committal activity is now the key-note of the whole of Pankraz' life until the lion cures him and he grows up from a boy into a man.

His running away from home when his sulkiness had proved ineffective both in that fight and with Esther has been mentioned above. Now, however, it becomes clear that this running away, although it sets the whole story going, is not really an action, inasfar as it does not react on the doer and change his character. To quote the words of Pankraz, his running away did not alter the fact 'dass ich mein Essen nicht verdiente',<sup>4</sup> in fact, it is just this change of self that he avoids. Spranger<sup>5</sup> sees in such an act a very typical instance of this crisis of boyhood.

<sup>1</sup> *Werke*, VII, p. 54

<sup>2</sup> *Werke*, III, pp. 132 seq., 88 seq.

<sup>3</sup> Goethe, *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, I, 2, Weimarer Ausgabe Bd. 26, p. 76.

<sup>4</sup> *Werke*, VII, p. 27.

<sup>5</sup> *Loc. cit.*

Real ingenuity is shown in the way in which the sulky boy succeeds in keeping on the 'useless' side of life. The necessity of earning one's living has always been one of the strongest means of life to force the individual to conform with society, to give up his self for the world. Pankraz, however, hits upon the idea of doing the work, but not doing it 'really'. The work he performs has no power to bring him into contact either with the thing he is doing, or with his co-workers, he robs it of all reaction and gives himself the part of a machine. With this kind of useless work he supports himself at the farmer's and with the boatmen. Here, as on every later occasion, he does not speak a word which is not absolutely necessary to keep the machine going. Thus he refuses to come into communication with the world. He does this quite consciously, his aim being, not to beg, and not to be obliged to anybody.<sup>1</sup> This is his freedom, a freedom, however, without aim. But he is mistaken in supposing that he has learnt to work, he has only learnt to do things and to put up with a hard life.<sup>2</sup>

Just because he has not learnt to work, the excursion to New York is unsuccessful. Here, so Pankraz thinks, he ought to have been most pleased with life as apparently everybody there did as he pleased.<sup>3</sup> The real reason for his hurried departure from this paradise is this: the kind of occupation which Pankraz carries on is not work that could give him a sense of justification, and that is just what work and the reward of work mean in the new world.

After this excursion the journey to India, 'Der älteste, traumerische Teil unserer Welt'<sup>4</sup> seems to have been inserted mainly as a contrast. What does India mean to Keller? In his *Traumbuch* of 1847 Keller has noted down a dream which throws a new light on this journey of Pankraz. 'Als mein Lebensschiff aus Ostindien zurückging, nachdem es seine Ladung abgegeben, wurden ihm als Ballast ausgestopfte Krokodile und wüste Seetiere, Tiger und Hyänen mitgegeben für die Raritätensammlung in Europa, um wenigstens einigen Nutzen mit der Fracht zu verbinden. Schwere Kisten voll wunderlicher Schnecken und Muscheln und Stachelpflanzen pfropfte man in die tiefen Räume, und als man das Schiff immer noch zu leicht befand, nahm man noch eine Truppe sünderhafter, nackter Bajaderen in die Kajüte, welche nach Paris bestimmt war.'<sup>5</sup> Here, too, as in *Pankraz der Schmoller*, India seems to stand not so much for something real, something experienced, but is just a con-

<sup>1</sup> *Werke*, VII, p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 31.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 32.

<sup>5</sup> *Traumbuch*, September 15, 1847. *G. Kellers Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1830-61, hrsg. v. E. Ermatinger (Stuttgart, 1924), p. 149, quoted as *Briefe*, I.

venient formula. But here it becomes clear what this formula stands for. India is the country of that man for whom life (the cargo of the ship) falls into two distinct halves which are both ineffectual stuffed animals and hot, sinful life. All sensuality, all passion is thrown on one side, but it remains non-committal, the bayaderes do not claim to be fought for, and they do not claim to have an influence in life. They are on the side of day-dreams and imagination and it is worth noting, how often there appears in Keller's dreams the figure of a girl who offers herself and does not commit her lover by having to be asked <sup>1</sup>

If on one side in this way all sensual desires find a non-committal representation, only the dregs are left on the other, empty shapes, "stuffed" animals'. It is this disintegration of life into imagination and empty order which Pankraz has to overcome.

Another interesting point is the choice of profession which Pankraz now makes. Keller's predilection for soldiering is known, as is also the fact that he himself never was a soldier except for two rather futile military excursions. There is Fritz Amrain's experience of civil war, and the 'grüne Heinrich', too, has to train as a soldier, so that the book in this respect deviates from its otherwise autobiographical character.

But what reasons induce the apparently peaceful boy Pankraz to become a soldier? He himself points out that the order and neatness with which every part of his life is kept in its own proper sphere, were very much to his liking <sup>2</sup> This, and his sulkiness which helped him a good deal in his new profession 'indem es mir eine vortreffliche lautlose Pünktlichkeit und Aufmerksamkeit erleichterte' <sup>3</sup> do not really answer our question but only lead on to the inner connexions between sulkiness and soldiering. Of greater importance is the other remark which Pankraz makes in this respect, namely that he need not thank anyone for his food and therefore is under no obligation. <sup>4</sup> This choice of profession now shows itself to be the effort of the sulky boy to cover the whole of life with a network of watertight formulas and to get away from the necessity of responding to any duty that may fall to him.

Further light is thrown on this point by the comparison between monastery and army drawn by Robert Graves in discussing the entrance of T. E. Lawrence as a private into the R.A.F.: 'The Army and the Air Force are the modern equivalents of the monastery, and after five years he (Lawrence) does not regret his choice of a life as nearly physical as an

<sup>1</sup> E.g., *Traumbuch*, August 5/6, 1846; Dezember 3, 1847. *Briefe*, I, p. 145-60 'Stoffe zu Erzählungen', Nr. 3, Ermatinger, *Leben*, p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> *Werke*, VII, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 32.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 32-3.

animal's, in which food is provided, and drink, and a round of work in harness and a stable afterwards until a new day brings a repetition of the work of yesterday.'<sup>1</sup> 'The being cared for, the rails of conduct, the impossibility of doing irregular things, are easements. The companionship of "shop", the enforced routine of simple labour, the occasional leisures are actively pleasant.'<sup>2</sup>

This shows the profession of a soldier fulfils the desire of a man for an active life, and this desire must be realised as one of the main moving forces in the world. But at the same time this profession is not burdened with a personal responsibility for the activity. The man choosing to become a soldier sees the possibility of maintaining an 'as if' attitude. He keeps an individuality reserved to himself and untouched by the outer world or his activities. This is exactly the situation which the sulky boy desires and which enables him to remain childish and adolescent for long years and even to become a colonel without growing up. (It should be needless to say that this is Pankraz' reason for becoming a soldier, there are many other equally good reasons. Nor does the quotation from Lawrence imply that his reasons were similar to those of Pankraz. In fact, the quotation only serves to illuminate one point, the real reasons of T. E. Lawrence for his action seem to be widely different.)

Into the 'Bildungsgeschichte' of Pankraz now comes the second great formative power; after hunger has been defeated, love enters his world. The appearance of the beautiful Lydia tests his whole clever scheme and it collapses. This at last seems to be the crisis in which his artificial world is destroyed and he grows up into his place in the real world. But this, unfortunately, is not the case with Pankraz' falling in love, and this is due mainly to two reasons

The first reason is his lack of courage which makes him unable to realise his love, to give it a place and a shape in the world of reality. Instead he escapes into an imaginative world and builds up a life of day-dreams. (The relation between sulkiness and imagination again comes into play) It is not when he is in her presence that he feels his love for her most, but when he is away from her 'denkt er vielfältig an sie'. In the end he even goes to the length of intentionally avoiding her presence in order to be the better able to think of her!<sup>3</sup> This surely is not the attitude of a Romeo who cannot await the end of his separation from his love, but that of a day-dreamer who does not live his life but imagines it. He even speaks of her only when mother and sister are

<sup>1</sup> Robert Graves, *Lawrence and the Arabs* (London, 1928), p. 48

<sup>2</sup> *Loc cit.* p. 425

<sup>3</sup> *Werke*, VII, p. 47.



asleep and not listening. It is true, Pankraz in the story does not know that his hearers are asleep, but to the author it was an unbearable thought to have this story of love being told to the world. It did not fit in with his conception of his hero, therefore he hit upon this very clever device. How far away is this Pankraz from the lover who cuts the name of his love on every tree to make her name known to the world!

This restraint is not shyness, it is unnatural, and its result is that he is mistaken about the real character of Lydia. Pankraz falls in love with the wrong person and that is the second reason for the failure of this new experience to cure him from sulkiness. At long last he throws himself at her feet and commits himself,<sup>1</sup> an action which hitherto he has believed to be impossible<sup>2</sup> and to which he is forced by the danger of the disintegration of the self into mere imagination.<sup>3</sup> But at this moment of his breaking through into a world of real action and reaction, of doing and suffering, Lydia shows herself to be the heartless creature which she always has been and which Pankraz hitherto had covered with the web of his imagination. The ensuing collapse throws him back completely into his sulkiness and with this incident the biography of Pankraz might very well end as he is now completely frozen up and settled in the various methods which his sulkiness has found of keeping him on the useless side of life. He is now the '*Eisheilige*' as indicated by his name, Pancratius.

The fact that the remarks on Shakespeare are made in connexion with the Lydia incident needs a special comment. The remarks themselves, the analysis which Keller gives of the great author, have always found the attention they deserve, but usually they have been looked upon as separate from the context. It is true, these remarks are the result of long years of thought and in themselves admirably sum up the art of Shakespeare. But there is a reason for the fact that Shakespeare and not Jean Paul is mentioned here: the dramatist Shakespeare portrays the real world with an intense truthfulness which no other author equals. And it is just the breaking through to reality that is the subject of this incident.

A conclusive proof that Pankraz, who meanwhile has become captain and commander of his own small force, is still a boy who puts day-dreams in the place of reality is his behaviour after his disillusionment concerning Lydia's real character. A short time of absence is sufficient to weave a day-dream of absolute loyalty over the real aspect of Lydia and to hide it. However, this time her mere presence is enough to break the spell.

<sup>1</sup> *Werke*, VII, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 59.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 54.

In the end the education of the sulky boy is completed by an event which in itself does not seem to have any particular importance. It looks more like a mere incidental beginning than a real cause. It is an act of brute force which in the end breaks the egoism of the sulky boy. Almost like a child he is sent into his corner with the one difference that the colonel has to stand for a long summer's day in the heat and obey another will than his own and this situation is at last sufficiently inescapable, even to such a perfect sulker. Here is no chance of finding an escape into the useless side of life.

The lion itself, of course, is not an educator and the whole incident looks rather trivial if compared with the effect. But it is a characteristic of such a complete revolution that it can start with almost any small incident, in education as in love there is no relation between cause and effect. The experience with the lion is a typical 'rebirth' which makes a new man. Pankraz vows to begin a completely new life, not only to turn over a new leaf. This conforms exactly to what Spranger<sup>1</sup> points out as the typical experience of adolescence.

But even here the circumstances are not entirely accidental. In May 1855, when Keller had got into a hopeless situation through his love for Betty Tendering—the love which was one of the inner reasons for the writing of *Pankraz der Schmoller*—he scribbled on his blotting paper: 'Ich sitze in der Wüste und mache Kalender.'<sup>2</sup> Here we have the beginnings of the lion motif, for it is not the animal but the Algerian desert with its relentless sunshine that is the real motif. It is the aridity, the idea of being hopelessly lost in deathly heat and barrenness that serves as a touching symbol of sulkiness.

The lion itself, on the other hand, is the concrete object which stands for all these different aspects. The education of Pankraz could not have been completed by a mere accident like an earthquake or a landslide which, like the lion, could have forced him to remain immovable on the same spot for a long time. The educational result would not have been the same; the colonel needs a very personal teacher for his lesson. Such an objective and visible sign of natural and unscrupulous will-power in the desert is the lion.

The completion of his education is followed by his return home to mother and sister. This is very subtle, the return home is not only the end of the story but it is more. It is the restitution of wrongs, the return to the beginning of the 'useless' life. The useful life has to go back to the very first beginnings, to the earliest twists in the path—a fundamental

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.* p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> *Ermatinger, Leben*, p. 243.

experience of all modern psychology. It is only at this point that a new beginning can be made.

This is the end of Keller's short story and this investigation, too, could end with it. However, as it is the story of an education, a 'Bildungsnovelle' in short, one more question must be raised. What idea stands at the end of this education? For in every true 'Bildungsgeschichte' the idea is primary and the various weaknesses from which the boy or young man is to be freed are only secondary. From *Parzival* to *Wilhelm Meister* and the wealth of romantic 'Bildungsgeschichten' down to Keller's contemporary *Stifter*, the idea towards which education is meant to go is quite clearly the true germ and soul of the book, no matter how much the substance of this idea changes from the Christian chivalry of Wolfram to the 'humanitas' of Goethe. Now if we look for such an idea in *Pankraz der Schmoller*, the astonishing result is that there is none! Exactly where this idea ought to have become visible the story comes to an end and we are left with a few vague promises to become 'umgänglich und freundlich', to go home and try to make life for himself and others as pleasant as possible.<sup>1</sup> We do not know what Pankraz will look like after he has outgrown sulkiness and become what he ought to have become long ago, a man. This child is not father to the man!

It is not the aim of the 'Bildungsgeschichte' to discuss and show the manly fulfilment of the idea. But in the true 'Bildungsgeschichte' a very definite aim is reached, however vague and experimental the way may have been. The aspect of the hero's education is throughout related to, and dependent on, this idea and it makes no difference if it is not known to the hero, nor even to the reader. Even the author himself very often develops the definite outlines of his guiding idea only in the course of his writing, nevertheless it is perfectly distinct.

With this one story as the only basis for investigation it is not possible to understand the significance of the fact that such an idea is lacking in *Pankraz der Schmoller* and that we are left instead with vague generalisations. This problem points to the connexion of our story with *Der Grune Heinrich*. It is this quest for the idea which forced Keller to rewrite his long novel and find a new ending, and it is this same problem which made him at the end of his life begin it all over again and try to solve it in *Martin Salander*.

Thus the discussion of *Pankraz der Schmoller* ultimately leads back to the main problems of the literature of this period. That manner of

<sup>1</sup> *Werke*, VII, p. 78.

depicting a world, called realism just because it believes that it has found the solution in describing truthfully and closely the many-coloured reflections of life, raises the very question its philosophy is bent on avoiding. It raises the questions of the sense of life and its values, questions of order and aim, and fundamental ideas.

F. WOLCKEN.

EDINBURGH.

## THE OSSIANIC POEMS IN HERDER'S 'VOLKSLIEDER'

IN Herder's *Volksheder* there are three poems translated from Macpherson's Ossian <sup>1</sup> It is perhaps surprising that there should be so few examples from a work which was at that time at the height of its popularity in Germany, and which, moreover, had been praised so highly by Herder himself in his *Fliegende Blätter* only a few years previously. The explanation is no doubt to be sought in the misgivings about the authenticity of the work, which were beginning to assail Herder as a result of his correspondence with the Irish soldier, Harold, and which were confirmed by his own subsequent thorough study of the poems.

As early as 1770, Herder had his doubts about the excellence of Macpherson's alleged translations, and he was anxious to discover the true nature of the original poems by turning from the modern adapter to the supposedly ancient bard. He recommended Goethe to translate from such fragments of the alleged Ossianic Gaelic as had been appended by Macpherson to his edition of 1765. When he forwarded Goethe's efforts to Merck in 1771, he expressed his distrust of translation at second hand in these words: 'Auf Macphersons Prosa, dunkt mich, haben Sie im Tone nicht so völlig zu verlassen...' <sup>2</sup> In this attempt to discover the real nature of the Gaelic verse, the extent to which Goethe's efforts were successful can be judged by the accuracy or otherwise with which he transferred the rhythm of the Gaelic into German. Goethe's very faulty transcription of Macpherson's in itself faulty Gaelic makes it very difficult for us to scan his lines, but as far as this can be done, a comparison of the Gaelic and the German reveals that Goethe was only moderately successful in maintaining the correct number of stressed syllables. Only three lines exactly reproduce the Gaelic rhythm, but altogether nine may be considered as more or less successful, e.g.

Line 5: Úllín, a Charril, a Raonó.  
Ullin und Carril und Raono.

Line 7. Clúimín síobh an dórchadas Shélmá.  
Hort ich euch, in Finsternis Selma

Line 12. An trúscaí ceo-mádhúis crúaim  
Ein hüllen Nebel; morgens tief.

<sup>1</sup> Herder, *Sammtliche Werke*, ed. Suphan, xxv, pp 423-30.

<sup>2</sup> *Briefe an Merck*, ed. K. Wagner, p. 27.

and further, lines 8, 15, 21, 28, 35 and 38. Twenty-four lines are failures, the general fault being that the German lines are longer than the Gaelic, owing to the unavoidable addition of unstressed syllables, e.g.

Line 1: Puaill<sup>ll</sup> téud, a mhic<sup>ll</sup> Alpín<sup>ll</sup> na mfon.  
Ruhr Sarte, du Sohn Alpíns des Gesangs.

Line 6: Guíth<sup>ll</sup> amsair<sup>ll</sup> a dh'aom<sup>ll</sup> ò-shéan.  
Stimmen vergangene der Tage vor Alters.

Line 13. Fár<sup>ll</sup> an érich<sup>ll</sup> gu<sup>ll</sup> fuaimar<sup>ll</sup> a ghrian.  
Dort aufsteigt mit G'ton die Sonne etc

The general conclusion at which we arrive is that the Gaelic frequently had four strong beats in a line. This impression evidently remained with Herder, but it was due perhaps to his own subsequent examination of the text, rather than to any convincing evidence in Goethe's version. Lines of this type certainly prevail in his *Volkshieder* extracts from Ossian.

Herder indicated in a footnote to these extracts that the renderings were not his own, it has long been accepted that, as the basis for his rendering of two of the three poems, he had used the translation, which, at his instigation, Goethe had made from the Gaelic. It has, however, recently been shown that Herder did not rely entirely on Goethe's efforts. The *Volkshieder* extracts set out to complete these fragments, and among the notebooks are to be found numerous carefully prepared studies 'für eine weitere Stelle, welche Goethe nicht übersetzt hatte',<sup>1</sup> and 'zu einem grossen Teil der Stelle, der Herder den Titel "Fillans Erscheinung" gab.. bis "noch harter tonte der Schall"...also für ein grösseres Stück als Goethe ihm verdeutscht hatte'.<sup>2</sup>

So far no careful comparison seems to have been made between the various versions, and opinions vary considerably about the exact nature of Herder's share in the work. When we examine these two extracts from Book 7 of *Temora* in order to discover how far Herder relied on Goethe's interlinear rendering,<sup>3</sup> we find that in Herder's version of *Fillans Erscheinung* only seventeen lines out of the one hundred and twenty-five are based on Goethe's studies, and that Herder has checked Goethe's rendering against Macpherson's English text and also against his alleged sample of the Gaelic original. There are deviations from Goethe's version in favour of both these forms of the original, e.g.

swimming = rollt (G.) = schwimmt (H.).

grey = finster (G.) = grau (H.).

<sup>1</sup> A. Gilhes, *Herder und Ossian*, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup> *Der junge Goethe*, ed. Max Morris, II, p. 110

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 91.

sleeps the husband —? = wie schlaft (G) = und schlaft —? (H).  
 father of the fallen = meines Vaters (G) = Vater des Todten (H.), etc  
 taobh ghorm = Busen finster (G) = Serte blau (H)  
 nial = Nebel (G) = Wolken (H)  
 snamh seachad = gehullet siebenmal (G) = schwimmt beiseit (H)  
 an taobh oitagh = auf duestern Luftiten (G) = auf Luftchen schleichend (H) (literally  
 'on the edge of a breeze')  
 seoid = Krieger (G) = Edeln (H.) (literally 'brave')  
 beo = starcken, — (G) = Todten (H).  
 o = uber (G) = von (H), etc

In the shorter poem *Erinnerung des Gesanges der Vorzeit*, Herder has translated the second, third and fourth stanzas independently. In the remainder, which relies on Goethe's attempt, he has referred to the English in order to make his version less incomprehensible, in two places the interrogative has its origin in Macpherson's text, in line 3 'sie', referring to 'Trost', translates 'it', which is absent in Goethe's rendering, and one line, 'gehüllt in Morgengrau', translates English which Goethe has ignored.

The long sections of *Fillans Erscheinung*, which Herder translated without help from Goethe, contain many interesting points. A cursory glance reveals that it is not merely a translation of Macpherson's English, as is often affirmed, there are many quite striking differences, e.g., in sleep = in Thaten, of the king = Morvens, shield = Schall, feeble = Todter, of kings = der Männer im Stale des Schimmers, etc. In addition to numerous deviations of this kind, there are twelve lines that bear so little resemblance to Macpherson's version, that it is impossible to consider them merely as inaccurate translations. The difficulty is however at once explained by reference to the specimen of Gaelic, the presence of two proper names in the Gaelic but not in the English makes it sufficiently obvious that this text was used: 'Rethlan' and 'Lubhar'. Further, the form of the Gaelic genitive is easily recognisable, 'nan cran', 'nan sian', 'nan sliabh', etc., which are rendered by 'am Baum', 'im Sturm', 'des Bergs', etc., and which have no counterpart in the English text. And with the help of a vocabulary, it is not difficult to ascertain that the twelve freely translated lines are in fact renderings of the Gaelic, viz.:

Line 16: Until the songs arise <sup>1</sup>  
 gu am eri' fon (yearning) marbh-ran (death song) nan teud (from strings).  
 Bis steigt von Saiten das Sehnen des Todtengesangs.

Line 44: Which is seen, and is then no more.  
 na h'òicha (in night), 'snach fhag a lorg (footstep).  
 Der schwimmt in Nacht dem Fusstritt hinweg.

<sup>1</sup> Only those Gaelic words are translated here, which will make the point clear; it is unnecessary to point out Herder's many mistranslations

- Lane 50. The dismal sign of war.  
bal-mosgla' (signal) do chath nan lot (of wounds).  
Verkündigung der Schlacht der Wunden.
- Lane 54. The harps of the bards untouched  
'mhosguil guth (voice) a bhais (death, destruction).  
Weinen die Stimmen der Tiefe.
- Lane 113. That rolls his sign on night.  
a thaomas an fhuaim (sound) air oicha.  
Der weckt den Schall der Nacht.
- Lane 114. Let the warrior roll his signs  
taomagh an seod a ghuth (voice) fein.  
Mag wecken der Krieger den Schall.
- Lane 116. My joy is great, voice of night.  
ta atis, mhic dubhra nan speur (son of darkness of the skies).  
Mein Leben ist's, o Sohn des dunklen Himmels.
- Lane 117. And burns all over my thought.  
loiga air m'anam gun ghruaim (without sadness).  
Ist Brand auf meine Seele, nicht Trauer mir.

In the remaining four lines, Herder has completely misunderstood the Gaelic, and has given a rendering that corresponds to neither of the forms of the original text; they are lines 94, 95, 102 and 121.

In the three stanzas of *Erinnerung des Gesanges der Vorzeit* which Herder translated without Goethe's help, there are a few similar, though less conclusive indications that the Gaelic original was used in addition to the English: sound = Saite, Sturm, schwimmt, etc

We see here the result of Herder's Gaelic studies in 1778,<sup>1</sup> the exact nature of which is revealed in the notebooks and papers discovered by Dr Gilles.<sup>2</sup> Our examination of the text would suggest that Herder's careful preparatory studies were intended to be something more than a check on Goethe's rendering, and more than an aid to attaining the true Gaelic spirit. He used his own results to eliminate what he considered to be the errors in Macpherson's rendering of the original Ossian. On the other hand, his use of the English text in places where Goethe had used the Gaelic, indicates that he considered comprehensible German to be more important than the exact music of the Gaelic. The suggestion that in preparing these poems for his *Volksheder*, Herder may possibly have used the translation by Harold, is not borne out by a comparison of the two, which show no trace of similarity.

A glance at the manuscript variants to these *Volksheder* extracts shows us that in those sections which Herder translated independently, the English form of the original was in the first place rendered accurately and literally, this fidelity to Macpherson's text was then in many cases

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. Haym, *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken*, II, p. 90

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *supra*



sacrificed in later revisions in favour of a wording taken from the Gaelic version, viz.<sup>1</sup>

- Line 47: The king took his deathful spear. (1765 ed )  
Grif der König zum Speere des Streichs (MS variant )  
Grif der König zum Speer. (Final text )
- Line 59: Blue shielded kings  
Blauschildige Könige.  
Blauschildige Krieger.
- Line 62: But when the third sound arose  
Als aufstieg zum dritten der Schall  
Als aufstieg noch einmal der Schall
- Line 77: Can danger shake his daring soul.  
Kann Schrecken erschüttern seine Seele stark }  
Kann erschrecken seine Seele so stark }  
Kann ihm erschrecken die starke Seele }
- Line 89: Thou art not a dream to his rest  
Du bist nicht ein Traum des Schlummers ihm.  
Du bist ihm nicht im Traume des Schlafs
- Line 92: Her helmet falls.  
Es fällt der Helm hinunter.  
Ihr sinket der Helm
- Line 93: Loud echoed  
Laut schallet.  
Es schallet.
- Line 98: A red star  
Rother Stern.  
Roths Sternlicht.
- Line 105: Times of old.  
Zeiten der Vorwelt.  
Helden der Vorzeit.
- Line 107: To warn me of Erin's danger  
Zu warnen mich vor Erins Gefahr.  
Die warnend tont vor Erins Fall.

We are now able to survey the development of these poems throughout the decade preceding the publication of the *Volkslieder*. The starting point was Goethe's interlinear version, which was the result of the studies in Strasbourg in 1770; the scrappy and haphazard nature of this attempt suggests that it may have been only the beginning of what was planned as a complete translation of the 7th book of *Temora*. Herder then filled in the gaps from the English text, which he borrowed from Goethe in 1771-2,<sup>2</sup> but the doubts raised in his mind by Harold's letters in 1775-6 made a return to the Gaelic seem to him advisable, hence his study of Celtic in 1778,<sup>3</sup> and the resulting modifications to the text as outlined above.

H. T. BETTERIDGE.

BIRMINGHAM.

<sup>1</sup> The Gaelic line is not quoted here, though in every case it has been referred to and has proved to be closer to the final text than either of the forms quoted.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Gilhes, op. cit.* p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. letter to Heyne, April 16, 1778.

## MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

### A MIDDLE ENGLISH PARAPHRASE OF JOHN OF HOVEDEN'S 'PHILOMENA' AND THE TEXT OF HIS 'VIOLA'.

In British Museum MS Addit 11307 is contained a long Middle English poem which was edited for the Early English Text Society by Dr Charlotte D'Evelyn under the title *Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ* and was published in 1921. The title was invented by the editor, but it aptly describes the content of the poem. Dr D'Evelyn, in her introduction, after giving a summary of the poem, attempted to determine its sources. She was not able to go much beyond the usual suggestions in such a case—the Bible, Hugh of St Victor, and Richard Rolle; but she also claimed that the author of the *Meditations* had incorporated into his text a shorter poem which she called the *Orison of the Passion*.

Actually, however, there is no question of a multiplicity of sources. The *Meditations* are nothing but a translation, or, perhaps more correctly, a paraphrase of a very famous Latin poem, the *Philomena* of John of Hoveden. This devout *Meditation* is the sole source of the English poem, which owes nothing to Rolle or to the *Orison*.

It is a surprising fact that very little has been known of John of Hoveden's poetry until recent years. The *Philomena* was printed at Louvain about 1488, at Ghent in 1516, and at Luxemburg in 1603. But few students of mediæval literature had read it, and it was often confused with the *Philomena* of Archbishop Pecham, which was itself, on occasion, wrongly ascribed to Bonaventura. Even Miss Hope Emily Allen did not feel able to say with certainty that Hoveden was actually the author of the *Philomena*, the poem beginning

Ave, Verbum ens in principio,

which is, none the less, quite certainly his work.<sup>1</sup>

In my *History of Christian Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1927, pp. 389 sqq.) I gave a brief account of Hoveden's poetry, and I had already begun a transcription from MS. Brit. Mus. Cott. Nero C. ix of Hoveden's poems, when Father Clemens Blume's edition of the *Philomena* appeared.<sup>2</sup> This is an excellent text, and it is to be hoped that the whole of Hoveden's poems will soon be accessible to students.

John of Hoveden inherited the Bernardine and Franciscan tradition.

<sup>1</sup> *Writings ascribed to Richard Rolle* (New York and London, 1927), p. 420.

<sup>2</sup> *Johannis de Hovedene Philomena*, in *Hymnologische Beiträge* (Leipzig, 1930), vol. iv.

He is pre-eminent the poet of the Passion—of the twofold Passion, we may say, of Christ and His Mother. The title of his great poem is *Meditatio de natiuitate passione et resurrectione Domini Salvatoris*, and, as we learn from MS. Nero C. ix, 'voluit editor quod liber meditationis illius philomena vocaretur'.

It is only necessary to compare the Latin and the English poem to see at once that the latter is a free version, sometimes expanded, more often compressed, of Hoveden's *Meditation*. The subject-matter of the translation is arranged in precisely the same order as in the original from beginning to end, and although the exigencies of rhyme compelled the poet to wander often from the strict meaning of the Latin, he had it always before him as his ideal and did not willingly follow his own intentions.

To afford an example of his method, I give the text of Hoveden's first three stanzas with the Middle English rendering:

Ave, Verbum ens in principio,  
caro factum pudoris gremio,  
fac, quod fragret praesens laudatio  
et placeris parvo praeconio.  
et tu, stella maris eximia,  
mater patris et nati filia,  
laude, precor, reple praecordia,  
cum sis laudis mirae materia.  
Virgo, David orta progenie,  
dola linguam hanc imperitiae  
in sonantis lyram placentiae  
et iam psallas manu munditiae.

Heyl be pou, sone of pe fader aboue,  
pat man bycome for mannes loue,  
Of þe I make þis prayssyng;  
Graunte it mote ben at þy lykynge;  
And pou, pe sterre pat shyneþ bryght,  
To heuene and erthe pou lenest light,  
Fforthfulle myn herte pat I may here  
To prayson þe pat hast no pere;  
Of Daundes kyn maud gentil,  
Pou make my tonke swete and sotil,  
Whan I þe shal prayse or grete,  
pat it sounþ as harpe swete.

This is a fair specimen of the skill of the translator, who succeeds in producing a poem of great charm, reproducing for his English readers the devotional quality of the original. This translation is a witness to Hoveden's influence in the fourteenth century, and affords evidence in support of the contention that he is a link between the Bernardine-Franciscan movement and the great English mystical movement of the fourteenth century. It is clear that Rolle was acquainted with Hoveden's poems, but the extent of his indebtedness to his predecessor has never been fully worked out. A complete edition of Hoveden is a prime necessity, and it is very desirable that Rolle's Latin poem which begins,

Zelo tui langueo virgo speciosa,

and is contained in MS. Rawlinson C. 397 of the Bodleian, should be published.<sup>1</sup> The present brief note is intended as a means of placing on

<sup>1</sup> F. M. M. Comper, *The Life of Richard Rolle* (London, 1928), p. 159, says that Hoveden's influence can be traced in it. On the same page she wrongly assigns Pecham's *Philomena praeva* to Bonaventura and thinks that Hoveden based his own *Philomena* upon the earlier poem, a conjecture that has little to support it.

record what is the true source of an important Middle English poem, and, it is hoped, of encouraging further research on the question of John of Hoveden's influence on English religious writers of the fourteenth century.

Most of Hoveden's poems are lengthy and they do not always escape the risk of tedium. The long *Canticum Amoris* is a meditation very much on the same lines as the *Philomena*, and there is another long meditation beginning

In laude nunc spiritus omnis exultet

All the poems show a great command of rhythm and a studied perfection of rhyme. The short poem called *Viola*, a rhapsody in praise of the Blessed Virgin, is a remarkable example of Hoveden's skill and I venture to give the text here in order to make one further poem of his accessible to students. It is taken from MS Brit. Mus. Cott Nero C ix, f. 225.

Incipit laus de beata virgine  
que Viola vocatur edita a  
Iohanne de Hovedene.

f. 225 r.

Maria stella maris  
fax summi luminaris  
regina singularis  
sublimitas polaris  
tu parens salutaris  
que prole fecundaris  
sed inexpertis maris  
tu luna transolaris  
tu via linearis  
10 lanx perpendicularis  
plus celo sublimaris  
plus melle dulcoraris  
plus sole serenaris  
plus nive candidaris  
plus rosa purpuraris  
plus flore venustaris  
thus deo consecraris  
oblatum sacris aris  
te matrem gratularis  
20 te virginem miraris  
regnando non inflaris  
sed plus humiliaris  
cum sola principaris  
tu funda figuraris  
tu vellere notararis  
tu rubo designaris  
archa quadrangularis  
tu tunica talaris  
tu lampas olearis  
30 virga mari minaris  
columba consolaris  
in fluctibus amaris

structura columnaris  
edes sacrati laris  
edes digna vocaris  
ut Iudith preharis  
ut acies armaris  
ut aurora levaris  
et regi desponsaris  
40 quo sine pare paris  
quem visu contemplaris  
quem amans amplexaris  
quo fruens iocundaris  
quo manens perhennaris  
quo vere solidaris  
quo summe radiaris  
quo iugiter bearis  
o que sic reclamaris  
me semper tuearis  
50 Maria stella maris  
  
Maria laus divina  
virginea regina  
vitis propinans vna  
languenti medicina  
tu salus repentina  
salvificans piscina  
tu summitas cedrina  
tabula cypressina  
viriditas laurina  
60 victoria palmaria  
tu panis officina  
letificans resina  
tu nux amigdalina

- tu solida carina  
 tu stella matutina  
 simplicitas agnina  
 tu framee vagina  
 stabilitas petrina  
 lux fulgens berillina  
 70 visio saphirina  
 sintilla iacinctina  
 fenestra cristallina  
 serenitas prasinina  
 tu rosa sine spina  
 tu sedes eburnina  
 puritas turturina  
 iuventus aquilina  
 facies columbina  
 qua rapies lupina  
 80 qua turbida rapina  
 merguntur in sentina  
 vis tibi leonina  
 ferocitas ferina  
 frons tibi serpentina  
 cervixque columbina  
 substernitur supina  
 tu vena nectarina  
 tu lex de monte Syna  
 tu vestis es bissina  
 90 thuribulum cortina  
 tu simile farina  
 ficella Moysyna  
 progenies Gessina  
 stola refulgens bina  
 stella polo vicina  
 salubris et marina  
 lucere nunc festina  
 nunc radium inclina  
 servantem a ruina  
 100 Maria laus divina. Amen.

- Maria fons dulcoris  
 tu laus cordis et oris  
 tu terminus languoris  
 remedium meroris  
 auxilium laboris  
 flos nivei pudoris  
 fax placidi fulgoris  
 et radius splendoris  
 tu lilium candoris  
 110 tu viola livoris  
 tu fiala decoris  
 tu virtus viatoris  
 altare libatoris  
 manipulum messoris  
 dapifera saporis  
 tu vitrum ablutoris  
 nubes sacrati roris  
 et aloes odoris  
 vexillum pugnatoris  
 120 laurus triumphatoris  
 vas manne punioris

225 v.

- tu smaragdus viroris  
 et acates honoris  
 carbunculus ardoris  
 topazion fulvoris  
 lux prasine mundioris  
 et adamas vigoris  
 tu templum salvatoris  
 que fures claudis foris  
 130 tu calamus scriptoris  
 tu tema laudatoris  
 neupma concinnatoris  
 vim mittigas furoris  
 tu tuis tenes thoris  
 prolem summi rectoris  
 quam sacris ligas loris  
 quam lacte dulcioris  
 inebrias amoris  
 que vernat cunctis horis  
 140 nitore tui floris  
 lux celi celsioris  
 sacri pincerna moris  
 liber legislatoris  
 volumenque lectoris  
 hosti mucro terroris  
 tu frenum exactoris  
 compendium cursoris  
 stipendium victoris  
 me iunge celi choris  
 150 Maria fons dulcoris.

- Maria firma ratis  
 velum velocitatis  
 anchora firmitatis  
 stella sublimitatis  
 spes firma naufragatis  
 in equore vexatis  
 dans iter Eve natis  
 ad portum voluptatis  
 tu lumen obscuratis  
 160 refugium venatis  
 solamen desolatis  
 dux es predestinatis  
 ad regnum claritatis  
 hostibus cathenatis  
 seras captivitatatis  
 frangis et captivatis  
 das regnum cum beatis  
 radix vivacitatis  
 flos speciositatis  
 170 et fructus sanitatis  
 fons es felicitatis  
 que rivos largitatis  
 propinas fatigatis  
 cum profers illibatis  
 visceribus sacratis  
 prolem divinitatis  
 que cum sit veritatis  
 testis et equitatis  
 iudex per te dat gratis

- 180 et gratiam ingratis  
et lumen excecatis  
et donum sanctitatis  
excessibus ablatis  
et penis relaxatis  
tu palma prohibitatis  
victoria prostratis  
tu rubore frustratis  
robor securitatis  
tu salus sauciatis  
190 tu parens puritatis  
virgo fecunditatis  
te mucro feritatis  
ferit cum pietatis  
lator et bonitatis  
in cruce cruciatis  
connectitur dampnatis  
o sidus honestatis  
vim vince tempestatis  
Maria firma ratis
- 200 Maria virgo pura  
paris absque lesura  
virum qui mortis iura  
mortificat casura  
tu levas ruitura  
tu sublevas lapsura  
restauras peritura  
te sauciat punctura  
cum cruciat pressura  
secatque dolatura  
210 regem mors immatura  
digneque moritura  
regem cuius factura  
est omnis creatura  
qui mortis a morsura
- surgit et ligatura  
leto facta fractura  
reditque reversura  
ad pascua matura  
ovis iam regnatura  
220 iam nunquam dolitura  
sed semper gavisura  
tu stella non obscura  
in polo remansura  
obscurum ablatura  
et lumen allatura  
iterque monstratura  
in fluctuum iactura  
marisque voratura  
conducens ad secura  
230 nunquamque transitura  
gaudia permansura  
thuribuli tu thura  
ad celos ascensura  
deumque placatura  
digna dei censura  
cuius est de te cura  
cum carnea iunctura  
carnalique natura  
ad thronum profectura  
240 tronosque precessura  
sceptrumque receptura  
ruentis mundi iura  
transcendis per futura  
nobis in hac tortura  
o cuius est statura  
velut palme mensura  
penas mitigatura  
assis in die dura  
Maria virgo pura.

Explicit Viola beate virginis a Iohanne de Hovedene edita

F. J. E. RABY

'SIR GAWAIN AND THE GREEN KNIGHT.'

ll. 14 ff.

14. On mony bonkkes ful brode Bretayn he settez  
wyth wyne,  
Where werre and wrake and wonder  
Bi sypez hatz wont þerinne,  
And oft bope blysse and blunder  
19. Ful skete hatz skyfted synne.

(*Sir Gawain and þe Grene Knyzt*, ed. Tolkien and Gordon, 1930.)

Tolkien and Gordon give for *wonder* (l. 16) in the Glossary the meanings 'prodigy, marvel, wondrous deed (or tale)', and in consequence translate the line as 'war and distress and marvels (or prodigies, etc.)'—I suppose interpreting the word *wonder* as an uninflected neuter plural—and presumably considering it as referring to the wonders to follow in

the story. But is this the correct interpretation? A parallel use of the word seems to occur in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, anno 1137 'þa the suikes undergæton ð he milde man was 7 softe 7 god 7 na iustise ne dide. þa diden hi alle wunder' (J. Hall, *Early Middle English*, I, p. 6) Hall notes *wunder* (II, p. 256) as 'dreadful deeds, destruction, a development of O E *wundor*, portent' This interpretation would round off l. 16 of *Sir Gawayne* 'War and distress and destruction'

It might be suggested that 'werre and wrake' are contrasted with 'wonder' in the same way as 'blysse' is contrasted with 'blunder' in l. 18 but the real contrast with l. 16 seems to be 'wyth wyne' of l. 15

ANGUS MACDONALD.

EDINBURGH.

#### AN EARLY TUDOR GRAMMARIAN.

Robert Whittinton, splenetic, plodding, vain, was a lesser star in the galaxy which held William Lilly and William Horman, and, in an age interested in grammar, Erasmus and Linacre, to whom he paid tribute in his own *Vulgaria*. Whittinton's works were popular in his day. They catered to the needs of schools and ran to many editions. Curiously enough, all of his grammars are deeply impregnated with his personality, a fiery, acrimonious nature, that permitted him to make scathing verses on Lilly and nail them to the doors of St Paul's for the boys of Lilly's school and all who might pass by to see. He was a Laureate of Oxford and held a preferment as schoolmaster to the henchmen or pages at the court of Henry VIII of which he was inordinately proud. Lilly and Horman, headmasters respectively of St Paul's and Eton, vigorously lampooned him in a curious book entitled *Antibossicon*, published by Pynson in 1520 and embellished with beautiful woodcuts of a bear baited by six dogs.

It would take a bibliographer with the patience of Job and the strength of Hercules to grapple with the grammars of Robert Whittinton that have survived the depredations of time. Living as he did (he was educated at Magdalen College School under Stanbridge) in the Anwykyll-Stanbridge tradition, Whittinton realised that schoolbooks should be brief and not discursive, and on this account, I presume, his grammatical tracts were deservedly popular. Many copies are in existence, and to reduce these finally to their various editions would be a highly laudable work.

That Whittinton aimed at a 'Corpus grammaticale' seems clear from a perusal of his books, but what form this was to take it is difficult

indeed to determine. He seems to have planned a vast, comprehensive grammar in two parts, *Accidence with Syntax*, and *Prosody*. The indications of this plan are to be gleaned from the title-pages of his books, but it is a disturbing fact that the second part of his grammar appeared before the first, and the second and third books of the first part before the first book. Working from title-pages, which alone give much information, it seems that the first book of the first part of Whittinton's projected Grammar was the *De nominum generibus*:

Grammatices Primae partis Liber primus Roberti W[hittintoni] Lauricomi Lichfeldiensi] nuperrime recognitus De nominum generibus

This was published in 1521 by de Worde, but Dibdin notices an edition by Pynson in 1519.

The second book of the first part of the Grammar was:

Grammatices Whittintonianae Liber secundus de nominum declinatione,

printed by de Worde in 1517.

The third book was the *De heterochitis nominibus* printed by John Scolar at Oxford in 1518.

Grammaticae Whittintonianae Liber tertius de nominum heterochisi.

The fourth book of the first part of the Grammar is not indicated by the title-pages, but the fifth book appeared in 1521 printed by de Worde as.

Grammaticae prima pars Roberti Whittintoni L[auricomi] L[ichfeldiensi] nuperrime recensita. Liber quintus De verborum praeteritis et supinis. cum commento necnon interliniari dictionum interpretatione.

A perusal of the same volume brings to light:

Grammatices Roberti W[hittintoni] L[ichfeldiensi] Liber Sextus. De verborum Formis de defectiuis et anomalis, confusis, syncopatis et apocopatis.

There is a copy of this tract in the British Museum printed by Treveris at uncertain date which, from the errors that abound in the printing, was probably one of the books Whittinton complained of in the verses against Treveris prefaced to the 1533 edition of the *De heterochitis nominibus*, printed by de Worde. This Treveris edition has an interesting departure from the de Worde title-page. The verses that appear under the title are headed:

Eiusdem Roberti Whittintoni Tetrastichon cum Thoma R.

Then follow the verses:

Auctius exit opus. facit hoc mihi Zolus acer  
Arbiter. is credit nil sine teste mihi.  
Imprudens peragit qđ nolit namque nocendo  
Prosit. quod cupio conciliatque mihi.



Under the verses are the words *Humilhabit calumniatorem* which appear also in the de Worde edition, but beneath them are the letters D T R. It would perhaps not be stretching a point too far to identify the mysterious T R with the grammarian Thomas Robertson or Robinson, subsequently dean of Durham, who, from 1526 to 1534, was master of Magdalen College School where, under Stanbridge, Whittinton had been educated.

The 1519 *Opusculum*, a laudatory volume in praise of Henry VIII, Wolsey, Brandon, More and Skelton, the 1520 *Vulgaria*, a collection of English sentences with Latin translations illustrating rules, and the 1525 (?) *Accidentia ex Stanbrugiana editione* do not fit into the scheme of a comprehensive grammar and may be considered as *obiter dicta*.

The 1512 *Sintaxis*, the 1516 *De Octo Partibus Orationis*, the 1517 *De Synonymis* (or *Lucubrationes*) and the 1521 *De Constructione* remain to be fitted into the mosaic that went to make up the first part of Whittinton's Grammar. Of these four volumes the *De Constructione*, 1521, is possibly to be identified with the *De Concinnitate Grammatices et Constructione*, de Worde, 1519 (Pynson, 1518, according to Ames), and, according to a note I have on an edition in the Huntington Library, de Worde, 1512. This again may possibly be identified with the *Sintaxis*, de Worde, 1512. Perhaps the *Sintaxis* is the missing fourth book of the first part of Whittinton's Grammar.

The 'Roberti Whittintoni lichfeldiensis grammatices magistri & protouatis Anglie in florentissima Oxoniensi academia laureati lucubrationes', consisting of

De synonymis,  
De epithetis,  
De variandi formulis tam pedestri quam soluto sermone,  
Experientie de virtutis immortalitate,  
De veterum romanorum magistratibus,

printed by de Worde in 1517 is somewhat outside the general scheme.

The second part of the Grammar is devoted to Prosody:

Secunda pars grammaticæ de syllaba & eius quantitate  
De prima media & vltima syllaba cognoscenda cum commento & interpretamento  
interliniari.  
De accentu secundum diomedem grammaticum  
De accentu apud recentiores magis obseruato.  
De impedimentis accentus.

This title is quoted from the 1519 edition printed by de Worde, but there are earlier editions in 1516 and, according to Dibdin and a note I have on an edition in the Huntington Library, 1513.

There is a possibility that Whittinton intended the *De Octo Partibus Orationis* and the *De Synonymis* as a seventh and eighth book to his first

part of Grammar. One can do no more than conjecture. That he projected a comprehensive and workable Grammar is obvious and it is likely that his contemporaries, amongst whom his works were popular, knew which part was which without relying on the testimony of title-pages and descriptions of contents.

BEATRICE WHITE.

HAILSHAM, SUSSEX.

#### GREENE'S 'RIDSTALL MAN'.

In *The Modern Language Review* (October, 1934, p. 434) Professor Renwick makes the interesting conjecture that when Bohun in Greene's *James the Fourth* is described as 'attyred like a ridstall man', Redesdale is referred to. Support for this view is to be found in William Bullein's *Dialogue bothe pleasaunt and pretifull...against the Feuer Pestilence*, which first appeared in 1564 and was reprinted in 1573 and 1578.<sup>1</sup> Among the twelve interlocutors are Civis, his wife and Mendicus. The wife, hearing something strange in the accent of the beggar, asks whence he comes. He replies 'Sauyng your honour gud Maistresse, I was borne in Redesdale in Northumberlande', and when she formulates her suspicion: 'Me thinke thou art a Scot by thy tonge', he answers: 'Trowe me neuer mare then gud deam, I had better bee hanged in a withie, or in a cowtaile, then be a rowfooted Scot, for thei are euer fare and fase'. However, in spite of his protest that 'the limmer Scottes hared me, burnt my guddes, and made deadly feede on me, and my barnes', and that he had inflicted heavy losses on them, so that none 'man for man durst abide me luke', the impression which his speech made on a southerner was evidently peculiar. His vocabulary includes, among other singularities, such forms as 'sackles', 'fase (=false) hartes', 'miccle tule (=toil)', 'mucle gud', 'sike gud people', 'wad (=would)', 'warlde', and so an Englishman unfamiliar with the north might well think that a Redesdale man and a Scot were practically identical. In conclusion, it may be pointed out that the third edition of Bullein's *Dialogue* appeared only a little more than a decade before the date when Greene's *James the Fourth* was probably written.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the publications of the Early English Text Society, Extra Series, LII (London, 1888).

## THE INTERPRETATION OF A PASSAGE IN 'HAMLET'.

It is heartening to observe that recent editors of Shakespeare are increasingly sensitive to their duty not only of establishing the words which he wrote, but also of revising the punctuation in such a way as to disclose his dramatic phrasing and emphasis. This latter task no editor has assumed more thoughtfully and boldly than Professor J. Dover Wilson, in the new Cambridge edition. Even those who, like the present writer, are troubled by some of his typographical devices and by his apparent inconsistency in using them, are none the less grateful for numerous insights afforded by his radical reconsideration of the pointing.<sup>1</sup>

Thus in his brilliant new edition of *Hamlet*, along with many verbal restorations, Professor Wilson offers a quantity of illuminating revisions of phrasing.<sup>2</sup> From his introductory statements concerning punctuation, indeed, and from his generous discussions of particular instances, one would infer that, whether or not it appear in his printed text of the play itself, no rational possibility of expressive pointing had been omitted from consideration. It may be, however, that this inference is somewhat too inclusive. It was, of course, impossible for Professor Wilson to record every arrangement of punctuation which, after due reflection, he decided to reject,<sup>3</sup> but in view of his hospitality toward suggestion in other instances, one feels that he has not dealt quite adequately with the highly important and animated passage in Act I, sc. ii, which he prints as follows:

<i>Hamlet.</i>	. . My father, methinks I see my father.	184
<i>Horatio.</i>	Where, my lord?	
<i>Hamlet</i>	In my mind's eye, Horatio.	185
<i>Horatio</i>	I saw him once, a' was a goodly king—	186
<i>Hamlet</i>	A' was a man, take him for all in all,	187
	I shall not look upon his like again.	188
<i>Horatio.</i>	My lord, I think I saw him yesternight.	189

The most significant part of this passage is the three lines 186–8, which (except for the dash at the end of line 186) Professor Wilson punctuates in a manner customary among the editors of the nineteenth century. Neither text nor note recognises the possibility of two decisive alterations shown in the following pointing of these lines:

<i>Horatio</i>	I saw him—once, a' was a goodly king—	186
<i>Hamlet.</i>	A' was a man. Take him for all in all,	187
	I shall not look upon his like again	188

<sup>1</sup> The devices for punctuation are deprecated, and inconsistencies are noted, for example, by Tucker Brooke in his review of Wilson's edition of *The Winter's Tale*, in *Modern Language Notes*, XLVII (1932), p. 477.

<sup>2</sup> *The Tragedy of Hamlet*, edited by John Dover Wilson, Cambridge, 1934. *Prolegomena* to this edition are contained in Professor Wilson's *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet' and the Problems of its Transmission*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1934.

<sup>3</sup> See Wilson, *Hamlet*, p. xxxii.

The variations shown here in lines 186 and 187 seem to have dramatic and stylistic implications which can hardly be ignored, hence the absence of a note upon them in Professor Wilson's *Hamlet* may seem to justify a further plea in their favour.

The use of a dash after 'him' in line 186 was suggested first, perhaps, by H. N. Hudson, although it is not actually printed in his text of the play. Hudson annotates the line as follows: 'Perhaps this should be punctuated with a dash after "him". Horatio is probably about to say "yesternight" (line 189) and blurts out "once"'.<sup>1</sup> The dash tentatively proposed by Hudson is inserted into the text itself by J. Q. Adams, and accompanied by a more extended annotation.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of this punctuation is to convey with greater precision Horatio's share in the tension of the dramatic situation. A few hours after his encounter with the ghost, Horatio comes in eagerness to report his horrifying experience to Hamlet. Early in the conversation Hamlet unconsciously startles him, and opens the way for his disclosure, by the visionary address, 'My father, methinks I see my father'. Horatio, his mind possessed by the image of the ghost, breathlessly demands, 'Where, my lord?' When assured that Hamlet means only *in imagination*, Horatio, it seems clear, precipitately utters the first words of his intended disclosure of an encounter with that father's image *in actuality*: 'I saw him——'; but a momentary irresolution or impulse of circumspection induces a hesitation, from which he issues lamely with the word 'once', and the feeble tribute, 'he was a goodly king'. By the time of his next utterance he recovers his courage, and delivers his excited message, 'I think I saw him yesternight'.

The interpretation of 'once' as a mere word of escape, without literal significance, seems to have the further advantage of reducing, if not of removing, a minor contradiction felt by some within the role of Horatio. Dr Greg, for example, takes the words, 'I saw him once', as proof that Horatio 'had only set eyes on him [the late king] on a single occasion', and as invalidating the impression conveyed by Horatio elsewhere in the first two scenes, that he was 'intimately familiar with the appearance of the late King of Denmark'.<sup>3</sup> This supposed contradiction Mr Percy Simpson undertakes to remove through a fresh literalism of his own:

<sup>1</sup> *The Tragedy of Hamlet (The New Hudson Shakespeare)*, introduction and notes by H. N. Hudson, edited and revised by E. C. Black and A. J. George (Boston, Ginn and Co., 1909), p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Hamlet*, edited by J. Q. Adams (Boston, Ginn and Co., 1929), pp. 20, 201-2.

<sup>3</sup> W. W. Greg, in *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xii (1917), pp. 408-9.

When Horatio says,

I saw him once, a was a goodly King,

he is beginning another of his descriptive reminiscences confined to a definite occasion like the reference to the angry *parle*.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly Simpson proposes that in a modern printed text a dash should be placed *after* 'once'

I saw him once—a was a goodly king—<sup>2</sup>

The objection to Simpson's interpretation would seem to be that Horatio's agitation in lines 185 and 189 precludes a lapse into 'descriptive reminiscence' in line 186. Both this psychological difficulty and the contradiction inferred by Greg are removed by the dramatic pointing proposed by Hudson and Adams.

The second alteration in punctuation which I am undertaking to defend is the use in line 187 of a full-stop after 'man'. The obvious purpose of such a pointing is to convey a richer significance and a more pronounced emphasis in Hamlet's words, 'A was a *man*'. The nearest approach to such an interpretation before the end of the nineteenth century appears to be that of Wieland, who translates the speeches of Horatio and Hamlet thus:<sup>3</sup>

*Horatio.* Ich sah ihn einmal; er war ein stattlicher Fürst.

*Hamlet* Sag', er war ein Mann, in allen Betrachtungen ein Mann, so hast du alles gesagt; seines gleichen werd' ich niemals sehen.

A somewhat similar emphasis was conveyed by Edwin Booth, whose customary recital of the passage is described by Dowden thus:<sup>4</sup>

Edwin Booth, in delivering this speech, paused after 'man', giving it as if something higher than 'king'.

Dowden's observation is reported by Hudson,<sup>5</sup> and is put into effect in the text of Adams, who prints, 'He was a man!' and explains the utterance as Hamlet's spirited retort to Horatio's lame and embarrassed tribute, 'a' was a goodly king'.<sup>6</sup> By way of further elucidation Adams adds, 'Hamlet here uses the word "man" as Burns does in his poem "A man's a man for a' that".'

<sup>1</sup> Percy Simpson, in *Mod Lang. Rev.*, XIII (1918), pp. 321-2. Professor Wilson had previously challenged Dr Greg's interpretation, in *Mod Lang. Rev.*, XIII, pp. 131, 134—but somewhat indecisively.

<sup>2</sup> Wilson (*Hamlet*, p. 153) refers to Simpson's proposal, but neither adopts it nor comments upon it.

<sup>3</sup> *Shakespeare Theatralische Werke aus dem Englischen übersezt von Herrn Wieland*, VIII (Zurich, 1766), p. 27.

<sup>4</sup> *The Tragedy of Hamlet*, ed. by Edward Dowden (*The Arden Shakespeare*), 4th ed. (London, no date), p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> In the edition cited above.

<sup>6</sup> See Adams, p. 202.

In support of the full-stop (or exclamation point), and the resultant emphasis upon the words 'a man', I should be inclined to draw, not upon Burns, but upon the text of Shakespeare himself. From *Hamlet*, and from other plays, it seems abundantly clear that for Shakespeare this expression conveyed a meaning of uncommon nobility and force, and that it was characteristic of his style to place the words 'a man' in the position of greatest emphasis, at the end of a sentence before a full-stop. The most beautiful of all examples of this Shakespearean cadence is the close of Hamlet's 'portrait' of his father <sup>1</sup>

See what a grace was seated on this brow—  
Hyperion's curls, the front of Jove himself,  
An eye like Mars to threaten and command,  
A station like the herald Mercury,  
New-lighted on a heaven-kissing hill,  
A combination and a form indeed,  
Where every god did seem to set his seal  
To give the world assurance of a *man*.

The personage so glowingly described here as 'a man', let it be remembered, is the very father characterised by the same words in the earlier passage under discussion. The same emphasis, requiring a similar finality of punctuation, seems to me irresistible in Hamlet's exclamation, 'What a piece of work is a *man*!' <sup>2</sup> Of the numerous parallels which might be drawn from other plays I set down only two or three

His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, 'This was a *man*!' <sup>3</sup>  
When you durst do it, then you were a *man*;  
And, to be more than what you were, you would  
Be so much more *the man* <sup>4</sup>

Yet Benedick was such another, and now is he become a *man*. <sup>5</sup>

If the two alterations in punctuation considered here commend themselves as conforming to the dramatic situation and to Shakespeare's stylistic habit, there appears to be no obstacle to using them in a modern text. Certainly the alterations are not forbidden by anything in the original printings of the play. Professor Wilson bases his text upon the Second Quarto of 1604-5, which, as he shows, was printed from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript, and which, as he infers, preserves

<sup>1</sup> III, iv, 55-62.

<sup>2</sup> II, ii, 307. Wilson, adhering to the pointing of the Second Quarto, uses a comma after 'man', thus dismissing, or at least concealing, the notion of exclamation, and the emphasis for which I am pleading.

<sup>3</sup> *Julius Caesar*, v, v, 73-5.

<sup>4</sup> *Macbeth*, I, vii, 49-51.

<sup>5</sup> *Much Ado about Nothing*, III, iv, 87. See also v, i, 65-6, and *Love's Labour's Lost*, v, ii, 668.

Shakespeare's punctuation 'almost untampered with'.<sup>1</sup> In the Second Quarto the lines under discussion are printed as follows.<sup>2</sup>

<i>Hor.</i>	I saw him once, a was a goodly King	186
<i>Ham.</i>	A was a man take him for all in all	187
	I shall not looke vpon his like againe	188

In accordance with his belief in the Shakespearean authenticity of the pointing in this Quarto, Professor Wilson adheres to it somewhat closely throughout his edition.<sup>3</sup> He freely admits, however, the necessity of altering the punctuation of the Quarto for purposes of intelligibility and dramatic effectiveness.<sup>4</sup> Thus, in the passage before us, he substitutes a dash for a point at the end of line 186 (presumably to indicate that Hamlet interrupts Horatio), and inserts two commas in line 187. In other parts of the play he inserts full-stops at places within speeches where the Second Quarto has no marks at all.<sup>5</sup> Hence it would appear that, although this Quarto may reproduce much of the fleeting punctuation that Shakespeare himself employed in the heat of rapid *composition*,<sup>6</sup> it fails in many instances to convey adequately to the modern ear the emphasis and pause which Shakespeare must have intended in the *recital*.<sup>7</sup> When we feel that we have discerned that intention, therefore, we are at liberty to depart from Elizabethan pointing in expressing it.

I hope I need not declare that in these few remarks concerning a single passage in *Hamlet* I am neither disparaging Professor Wilson's superlative edition, nor insisting that he adopt in his text the punctuation of Dr Adams, which I happen to approve. I am merely attempting to emphasise two details of interpretation which seem to me not unimportant,

<sup>1</sup> See Wilson, *Manuscript*, I, pp. 94, 101, II, pp. 192, 196-215; *Hamlet*, pp. xxx-xxxii

<sup>2</sup> The First Folio prints

<i>Hor.</i>	I saw him once, he was a goodly King.
<i>Ham.</i>	He was a man, take him for all in all
	I shall not look vpon his like againe.

The First Quarto of 1603 prints

<i>Hor.</i>	I saw him once, he was a gallant King
<i>Ham.</i>	He was a man, take him for all in all,
	I shall not looke vpon his like againe.

<sup>3</sup> See Wilson, *Hamlet*, pp. xxx-xxxii

<sup>4</sup> See *Hamlet*, p. xxxii.

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, the editing of Hamlet's first soliloquy, Wilson, *Manuscript*, II, p. 198, and *Hamlet*, pp. 13-14. 'No doubt, a modern editor will have to use the full-stop, and occasionally a colon or semi-colon, more often than the Q<sup>2</sup> compositor' (Wilson, *Manuscript*, II, p. 208)

<sup>6</sup> See Wilson, *Manuscript*, II, pp. 196-7

<sup>7</sup> In reviewing Wilson's edition of the play, Dr Greg expresses himself concerning the punctuation in the Second Quarto as follows 'It is reasonable to suppose that his [the compositor's] light punctuation reproduces that of the manuscript with some fidelity. Though to our ideas often deficient and at times obviously erroneous, it is on the whole, according to Elizabethan principles, satisfactory enough.' See *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xxx (1935), p. 82.

and the ignoring of which in the commentary of our most remarkable edition of the play suggests that they may be less widely known than they deserve.

KARL YOUNG.

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U S A

A NOTE ON A PASSAGE IN 'GUIGEMAR'.

Like Perceval in the *Queste*, the hero of *Gugemar* (Marie de France, *Les Lais*, ed. Hoepffner, Bibliotheca Romanica (1921), I, pp. 9, 10) finds a ship of splendid appearance riding by the seashore, when he is in grievous affliction; he enters this ship, and his 'garison' is thenceforward assured. Both Perceval and Gugemar find in the ship a bed, which is even more splendid than the ship itself; but whereas the allegory of the 'fuissiaux' provides a long and important development in the *Queste*, Marie is content with a description in twelve lines, beginning thus (ed. cit., vv. 170-4):

Enmī la nef trova un lit  
Dont li peçol et li limon  
Furent a l'uevre Salemon  
Taillié a or, tot a trifoire  
De ciprès et de blanc ivoire.

The words 'a l'uevre Salemon', which do not seem to have been perfectly elucidated as yet, may serve to indicate the source of this description. In the *Song of Songs* (cap. III, vv. 9, 10; Vulgate) occurs the following passage:

Ferculum fecit sibi rex Salomon de lignis Libani, columnas ejus fecit argenteas, reclinatorium aureum, ascensum purpureum

The presence in both texts of a bed of Solomon's 'making', with precise mention, in each case, of the materials—gold, and 'the wood of Libanus', or 'cypress'—is unlikely to be a fortuitous coincidence, since Marie was certainly not ignorant of the Bible.

If this source be admitted, other elements of Marie's description may be assumed to have a similar origin. 'Li peçol' and 'li limon' may represent 'tigna' and 'laquearia' (*Cant.*, I, 16); 'ciprès' and 'ivoire' can be paralleled in 'cypressina' and 'eburnea' of the Song (*Cant.*, I, 16; VII, 4); and, finally, the lines:

Le covertor de sabelin  
Vous fu de porpre Ahxandrin

may be supposed to echo the biblical 'ascensum purpureum', rendered in the English Authorised Version by 'the covering of purple'.

NIGEL ABERCROMBIE.

OXFORD.

M. L. R. XXX

23



## CONSIDERATION OF A DIFFICULT VERSE IN THE 'VIE DE SAINT ALEXIS'.

MS L, Stanza 107, c. Si grant ledece nus est apar(e)ude  
 d. D'icest saint cors, *que avum am bailide*,  
 e Par lui avrum, si Deu plaist, bone aiude

In the 107th stanza of the MS. L of the *Vie de Saint Alexis* we find the assonances *menude: cure. aparude: bailide. aiude*. How are we to consider the word *bailide* (= *baillie*, possession) which is not in the other manuscripts (A: *mune*; P hemistich missing, V *munere*), but which exists in the following stanza of L (108c. *Pur cel saint cors qu'il unt en lur baillie*)? Gaston Paris solves the difficulty by rejecting the reading of L in favour of that of A, *Di cest seint cors navum sorn daltre mune*,<sup>1</sup> L, he says, in his 1872 edition of *Saint Alexis*, p. 193, has a reading 'dont il n'y a rien à faire et qui n'est que le second hémistiche du vers 108c légèrement modifié et ne fournissant pas de rime'. It is, however, incorrect to say that *bailide* does not rhyme with the other end-words. I have shown elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that the one definite thing we can say about the scribe of the MS L is that he was a typical Anglo-Norman, and it was a common thing for twelfth-century Anglo-Norman copyists to confuse the sounds *u* and *i*, and to make them rhyme or assonate together. In the *Vie de Saint Grégoire*, for example, we find *truusses: peusses*, v. 439, in *Hugo de Lincoln*, *urent. vrent*, and in the *Cumpoz* of Philippe de Thaur, *lune: embolisme*.<sup>3</sup> It is then quite probable that for the scribe who copied L, *bailide* was a perfectly acceptable assonance.

But what of the word *mune* in the MS. A which Gaston Paris adopts as being the reading of the original? Paris recognises the extreme rarity of the word—it occurs in no other ancient text—but derives it from a form *muna* in the Glosses of Isidore: 'ce mot s'explique très facilement par le latin *munera*, pluriel neutre devenu singulier féminin, comme il arrive si souvent; *munera* avait donné une forme *muna* déjà en latin populaire, comme le prouve ce passage des Glosses attribuées à Isidore: *Muna, munera quae militibus dantur*.' As it stands, this explanation is entirely satisfactory, and it was universally accepted until Pio Rajna pointed out (*vide Archivum Romanicum*, vol. 13, article on the fragmentary Vatican MS) that the word in the Glosses of Isidore was not *muna*, but *munia*. In place of A's reading *mune*, Pio Rajna proposes the substitution of '*munre o mundre, così richiedendo imperiosamente anche*

<sup>1</sup> Here, as in many other places, the late Canon Meunier in his edition of *S. Alexis* (Paris, 1933) simply follows the lead of Gaston Paris.

<sup>2</sup> *Saint Alexis, Etude de la langue du MS de Hildesheim* (Paris, 1934).

<sup>3</sup> A full discussion of this Anglo-Norman peculiarity, together with further examples, will be found in H. Suchier's *Les Voyelles Toniques du Vieux Français* (Paris, 1906), p. 22, and A. Stimming's *Der Anglo-Norm. Boers de Harmlone* (Halle, 1899), p. lvi.

*l'assonanza*. There are two reasons why this substitution appears to me unnecessary; firstly the assonance does not, to my mind, demand a form *munre*, and secondly, in spite of the *muna* of the Glosses, the form *mune* is perfectly acceptable from the phonetic point of view. *Munera* is a learned word of the same type as *virgine* and *angele*, and must, like them, lose its last syllable and give *mune*, just as *angele* gives *ange*.

It would appear, then, that the copyist of L, not understanding the rare word *mune*, has altered the line with the help of 108c, whereas the copyist of P, for whom the word was equally incomprehensible, has simply omitted the difficult passage.

The fact that the scribes of A and V alone use the word sheds no new light on the question of the date of L, but it does confirm me in the belief that the Vatican MS. is not so ancient as it was at first considered to be.

CHRISTOPHER STOREY.

SCARBOROUGH.

#### SCHILLER'S 'RAUBER' IN ENGLAND BEFORE 1800.

The following brief account of Schiller's *Rauber* from the *Dublin Chronicle* of Saturday, November 29th, 1788, antedates in publication, if not in composition, what has hitherto been regarded as the first English criticism of this play, viz. Henry Mackenzie's 'Account of the German Theatre', read before the Royal Society of Edinburgh on April 21st, 1788, and first published in 1790, in the *Transactions* of that Society.

#### *Literary Intelligence of Europe.*

[The article quoted below is preceded by an account of the distribution of prizes at the University of Gottingen.]

.. For many years past the Germans have been making gigantic strides towards perfection, in Literature and in the Fine Arts. Their style in painting, though not such a close and bigoted imitation of the Antique as prevails in the Italian schools, is perhaps something better—a close imitation of Nature. In music, especially instrumental, they have left the composers of Italy far behind. Every refinement in modern music, with a very few exceptions, has arisen from the fancy and science of some German artist.

Musicians and painters of eminence, the darlings of society, generally travel, spreading their own fame, and bringing honour to their native soil. Men of letters on the contrary are too often condemned to a stationary and sedentary existence. Even without emigration, the fame of the former class must spread abroad, by means of their associates and pupils, while the reputation of the poet (a solitary, insulated animal) must remain circumscribed—he needs no brush-cleaner nor second violin.

These obvious remarks seem to account for the general ignorance of German Literature, especially poetry. The names of Handel, Abel, Bach, Haydn, Vanhal, Schroeter, Cramer, &c. are familiar in every polite circle, but who has heard of Lessing, Leisewitz, Unzer, Goethe, or Schiller?

'Though last, not least'—Schiller, thou shalt be known, in a country where a poet, of whose spirit a double portion seems to rest upon thee, is esteemed 'the god of our idolatry'.

The first Tragedy of Schiller, entitled the Robbers, had unexampled success in the theatres where it was allowed to be played, for in several places, the representation of it was prohibited.

Schiller is not one of those wretched would-be Poets, who by cunning or chance get upon the stage, and whose compositions, however stupid, strut and fret their hour'. He is a youth born to astonish the age, by the vigour of his genius, and his fortune will interest every feeling heart.

A fastidious critic, upon reading his tragedy above-mentioned, would say, that it displays both in the choice of the principal incidents of the plot and their particular management—bad taste. yet the numberless strokes of sublimity which occur, and above all, something dreadfully interesting, which magically hurries the readers along, might cover a far greater multitude of faults than this piece contains

To give any satisfactory analysis of it, is nearly impossible. Even the emotions which the perusal of it excites, cannot be described. Its Hero is an unfortunate youth, of noble birth, ruined by villains, and abandoned to remorse and despair, who, like Achilles in his rage, or like a more familiar hero, Robin Hood, swears to protect the weak against the strong, to avenge the injuries of the poor upon the rich,—to be, in short, the chief agent of Providence in regulating society

The idea is romantic and absurd, yet captivating. When this wonderful drama was performed in Fribourg in Bresgaw, all the youth of that city, the flower of the nobility, moved almost to madness by such ardent and awful scenes, formed the wild design of imitating Schiller's hero and his companions. They bound themselves by the most horrible oaths, resembling those used by Cathine, to betake themselves to the woods, and live by rapine and plunder; or, as they termed it, to become the Exterminating Angels of Heaven. Fortunately the plot was discovered by one of their tutors finding a copy of the Confederacy, written it is said, with blood. They were all secured, and the future representation of The Robbers in that city was prohibited. Such terrible impressions evince the energy of Schiller's pen, which, like Rousseau's, may be said to *burn the paper*. The fact is known all over Germany.

What the author's own opinion of his work is, may be best learned from his own words. In the Prospectus of a periodical work on morals, which he published, he thus writes of himself and his earliest production...

[Here follows about a column of translation from *Die Rheinische Thalia* of Nov. 11th, 1784, beginning: 'I write as a citizen of the world. I serve no Prince...' and ending: 'My breast swells at the sublime idea—that I shall have no judge but the Human Heart.']

M. Schiller now resides at Manheim, where he enjoys the title of Privy Counsellor to the Elector of the Palatinate Baviere. Since *The Robbers*, he has published three other tragedies—*The Conspiracy of Fresko—Love and Faction*—and *Don Karlos* (Don Carlos) Infant of Spain, said to be far superior to the Tragedy of M. Mercier or the romance of Abbe St Real, on the same subject.

The anonymous writer is aware, as Mackenzie was, that Schiller was educated at the Duke of Wurtemberg's Military Academy, but until evidence of identity is forthcoming it is to be assumed that he derived his information at second hand. Indeed, certain points of agreement with Mackenzie's account of Schiller, e.g., the spelling 'Manheim' and 'Fribourg', the reference to the students' conspiracy in the latter town, the inclusion of Unzer (Professor Johann Christoph, of Altona) in

the list of prominent German writers, and the phrase 'the vigour of his genius' (cf. Mackenzie 'his genius by its own native warmth and vigour') indicate a common source for part of the article at least. Mackenzie's sources were confessedly French, and the anonymous writer's references to the Palatinate Baviere, to Fribourg, and to Mercier and St Real point in the same direction. He has the advantage of Mackenzie in his ability to quote the titles of the next three plays

G. WATERHOUSE.

BELFAST.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To

THE EDITOR,

*The Modern Language Review.*

SIR,

You will perhaps permit me to express my appreciation of the long and conscientious review of the first volume of my edition of John Marston's plays, contributed to your January issue by Dr W. W. Greg. A serious student is always grateful for criticism, and Dr Greg would have failed in his duty had he failed to draw attention to what he conceives to be the many faults of my edition.

As honesty compels me, however, to repudiate the great majority of Dr Greg's charges (many of which, especially his criticism of my text of *The Malcontent*, are based on a misapprehension) I wish to intimate that a full and detailed reply will be included in the second volume, which I expect to publish in the autumn of this year.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

H. H. WOOD.

EDINBURGH.

## REVIEWS

*Chaucer's Use of Proverbs.* By BARTLETT JERE WHITING. (*Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature*, XI) Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, London: H. Milford 1934. xii+297 pp. 12s 6d.

In his Introduction Mr Whiting complains that little has been done to illustrate Chaucer's use of proverbial material which he rightly claims is both skilful and effective. With this point of view few will disagree, for the work done by Haeckel, Klaeber and Skeat (to mention only three) was necessarily incomplete. Unfortunately it can scarcely be said that Mr Whiting has completed his task as ably as one could have desired. This we would hasten to add is not entirely the author's fault, for much has been lost by his abandonment owing to expense of the finding-index which he had originally contemplated. This need not, however, have been done if Mr Whiting had been willing to dispense with his lengthy appendices which are of little value as such. By way of consolation we are informed that 'since a finding-index was not feasible, a full table of contents takes the place of an index of Chaucer's works' (p vii)!

The more one examines this table on pp. 7-9, the less one is impressed by it. The total additions at the end of it show that Chaucer in 41,987 lines of poetry uses 187 proverbs, 630 proverbial phrases and 421 sententious remarks. The totals are impressive but we have first to agree with Mr Whiting's individual identifications and classification, and the separate items for each poem reveal that one of the major weaknesses of this volume is the author's passion for statistics which are right and valuable in their proper place but which are dangerous snares for the inexperienced. The individual poems vary so considerably in length that any attempt to compare one poem with another is useless.

Mr Whiting anticipates criticism on his definitions. He defines a proverb as a saying, popular in origin or in usage; a sententious remark as a saying of learned origin, and states that 'a proverbial phrase is not ordinarily a directly monitory piece of wisdom'. This last is surely a most incomplete and unsatisfactory definition and we are obliged to examine a good number of Mr Whiting's examples before we grasp the exact meaning of his remarks. On the whole the present reviewer is normally in agreement with the author's identifications and classification, but there are naturally numerous examples of cases where one is very doubtful whether a proverb was intended at all. Mr Whiting was, however, well advised to be inclusive rather than exclusive.

An Introduction of seventeen pages can scarcely be expected to be exhaustive, and apart from a few pithy and valuable remarks is frankly disappointing. Most of it is taken up with a comparison (largely in statistical form) of Chaucer's use of proverbs with that in the *ballades* of Deschamps and the *fabliaux*. Of these the former is the more enlightening, but there is little dealing directly with Chaucer. The bulk of the book is occupied with a study of Chaucer's proverbs and proverbial material in

relation to the context. In the chapter on the shorter works where the material is slight, the author can admittedly do little more than record the actual findings without much comment, but in his chapter on *Troilus and Criseyde* Mr Whiting's treatment is excellent and valuable. The context is given in an illuminating manner so as to bring out the exact value of the proverb in question. His general conclusions are likewise worth study, as he demonstrates how Chaucer used proverbs in *Troilus and Criseyde* largely for purposes of characterisation especially in the case of Pandarus and Cressida. In his treatment of the *Canterbury Tales* the author's comments are often interesting and deserve to be widely read.

Chapter v, which consists largely of the proverbial material in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, concludes with a comparison of Chaucer's use of proverbs with that of Gower who almost invariably employs them to point a moral; so he puts them into the mouth of Genius, the priest of Venus. Chaucer, on the other hand, used them to advance the narrative and found in them a valuable means of characterisation.

Chapter vi is a mere list of proverbial phrases found in Chaucer's works, and is given without contextual notes or comment of any kind. This list is supposed to be in alphabetical order, but the reader is left to discover the keyword for himself. This omission could have been obviated by the use of heavier type or by some other simple device. In the appendices the author gives lists of the proverbial material in the works of Deschamps, in the *fabliaux* and in the works of Gower, but again entirely without comment. Two minor criticisms remain to be made: there is no bibliography and the notes are gathered together in eight and a half pages at the end of the volume. This in actual practice proves to be a most unfortunate arrangement, for mere references to editions, etc., would have been much more conveniently placed in footnotes. Thus in the course of a single paragraph (p. 49) the reader is required to make seven references to the notes.

There are some good things in this book but they are difficult to find, yet when they are found they are well worth while, and it would be a pity if this work should not be read because of its obvious imperfections.

J. P. OAKDEN.

ST ANDREWS.

*Caxton's Tulle of Olde Age*. By HEINZ SUSEBACH. (*Studien zur englischen Philologie*, herausgegeben von Lorenz Morsbach u. Hans Hecht, No. LXXV.) Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1933. 118 pp. 5 M.

The translation of Cicero's *De Senectute*, probably by William Worcester, published by Caxton in 1481, has no literary value and very faint biographical interest. The fact that it was made, and that it was made from the French, is of some consequence in the history of literature, but the text of the work itself deserves attention only as a specimen of the language of the later fifteenth century, especially as affected by the French.

The value of Dr Susebach's reprint, accordingly, depends on the accuracy with which it gives Caxton's text. The ideal set by the editor

has been very high, involving the correction in the body of the work only of errors which Caxton himself would have recognised as misprints, and indicating in the notes even the most trivial of the deviations from the original down to turning letters straight and replacing the dots in broken *i*'s.

The appendix gives a list of the words of French origin in the work. It is a pity that the editor did not think of checking the list with the *New English Dictionary*, and indicating which words were already established in the language, which had recently come in, which seem to appear for the first time in the translation, and which have since become obsolete. A cursory glance seems to indicate that the translator was conservative, and that few of his words of French origin have since disappeared from English.

Miss Isabel Barrows at my request has kindly collated Dr Susebach's text with the original at the British Museum on which it is based, and offers some criticisms. There appears to be some inconsistency in his method of reproducing that text. Editorial corrections are made, sometimes with a note calling attention to the change, sometimes using italic type for the purpose, and sometimes *sub silentio*. Yet he reproduces *thouh* and *though* and *wordly* and *worldly* on the same page. Words separated in Caxton's print are sometimes joined as one word and *vice versa*. The punctuation, a matter of some importance, is not accurately reproduced. There seem to be indications that the task has been done from photostats, a procedure that handicaps the scholar in a task which offers scope mainly to the virtue of accuracy.

H. B. LATHROP.

MADISON, U.S.A.

*Edward II.* Edited by H. B. CHARLTON and R. D. WALLER. London: Methuen. 1933. ix + 226 pp. 8s. 6d.

The final volume of *The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe* completes one of the most attractive editions yet produced of an Elizabethan dramatist. Beginning with Professor Tucker Brooke's excellent *Life of Marlowe*, each of the six volumes has added something to our knowledge of Marlowe as poet or playwright. In particular, the editors have demonstrated the thoroughness with which Marlowe made himself master of his sources before transmuting them in the fire of his imagination. The editors have done their work with a like thoroughness, and both they and the general editor, Professor Case, deserve our gratitude. Marlowe can now be read in an edition worthy of a great poet, one in which scholars bring into play all their knowledge without forgetting that the final purpose of scholarship is to increase the understanding and enjoyment of the poet's work.

Since *Edward II* was last edited, the change in opinion concerning Shakespeare's plays on Henry VI has suggested a new view of his relationship to Marlowe. The present editors conclude that, instead of learning the chronicle-play from Marlowe, Shakespeare was the first of the two dramatists to attempt the form. The success of 2 and 3 *Henry VI*

influenced Marlowe in 1591 to write *Edward II*. Certain verbal parallels between the plays were formerly accounted for as the language of Marlowe, retained by Shakespeare from Marlovian plays on Henry VI. Several of the passages, however, fit more naturally into Shakespeare's plays than into *Edward II*, and Marlowe, therefore, may have been the borrower. If so, *Edward II* was written soon after 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, and under their influence in much more essential matters than phrasing. Marlowe's influence in turn upon Shakespeare, as in *Richard II* and *Richard III*, has always been recognised. But if Marlowe was as prompt to learn from Shakespeare as Shakespeare to learn from him, what might not two such dramatists have accomplished had Marlowe lived, each putting the other on his mettle to match and surpass his competitor's dramatic triumphs?

In their introduction the editors discuss with especial care the date of composition and the way in which Marlowe dramatised Holinshed. Their presentation of the evidence for dating the play is admirably clear and closely reasoned. After balancing the parallel passages with the nicety of handling which such evidence requires, they incline on the whole to place the writing of *Edward II* after Peele's *Edward I* and Shakespeare's 2 and 3 *Henry VI*, but before 1 *Henry VI*, *Arden of Feversham*, and *Solyman and Perseda*. Since *Arden of Feversham* was registered in April 1592, followed in September by *Solyman and Perseda*, and since both plays borrow lines from *Edward II*, Marlowe had probably written the latter by the autumn of 1591. The title-page, however, announces that the play was publicly acted in London by Pembroke's Men, who are not recorded in London before the Christmas of 1592. The editors do their best to explain 'the odd circumstance that the play was not known to the London stage until December 1592'. The date is perhaps too precise, seeing that most of the evidence has vanished, and an interval of over a year between the composition of the play and its first production in London seems unlikely. Even though no record of performance survives, *Edward II* may equally well have been acted in London during the first half of 1592.

The excellence of the introduction sets a high standard which is maintained in the text and notes. The few oversights include 'Robert Nicol' for Richard Niccols, 'Hobson' for Hotson, and 'Thomas Watson', indexed as the author of *Decacordon*, for William Watson. It is left uncertain whether or not Drayton knew *Edward II*; but may not the brave opening of the Agincourt ode echo unconsciously the first line of Marlowe's fourth act, 'Fair blows the wind for France'?

MARK ECCLES.

LONDON.

*Francis Meres's Treatise 'Poetrie': A Critical Edition.* By DON CAMERON ALLEN. (*University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, vol. XVI, Nos. 3, 4.) Urbana: University of Illinois. 158 pp. \$1.50.

Francis Meres' *Palladis Tamia* which contains the Treatise 'Poetrie' is well known from the use that has been made of it as an indication of date. English books mentioned in it must have been written by the



year 1598, others apparently unknown to it may be considered to be later. As some of Shakespeare's writings fall into the one class and some into the other, for determining the dates of particular works *Palladis Tamia* is of enormous value.

Meres however was not content to give the bare dates of books, he attempted to show the claims of our infant literature by comparing its productions with others in Greek, Latin or Italian, and hence to appraise the value of each. How far he succeeded in this part of his task it is the main aim of the author of this work to determine.

He notices that Meres in his own day was only referred to by two writers, by Heywood who gave him a word of praise and Ben Jonson who administered a little satire. Meanwhile from the time of Nathan Drake it has been the fashion to praise him as a thoughtful critic, though some doubts have been expressed more or less boldly by Santsbury, J. M. Robertson, Herford and Simpson, Seccombe and Allen, Gregory Smith and Dixon. No one of these scholars however has made a critical examination of Meres' work. This has been left to Mr D. C. Allen, who as a pupil of Professor T. M. Baldwin of Illinois is well acquainted with the methods of English schools of this date and with the school-books they employed. The result is to show how much of Meres' supposed learning can be traced to well-known books of reference and how little is due to Meres himself who followed the principle of Imitation which he had learnt at school and at the university. Above all Textor's *Officina* proves to have been the literal source of the statements made about the classical authors, and where Textor is not available, Meres finds other information ready to hand in Webbe, Sidney and Ascham. Every critical statement about an English author may similarly be traced to Ascham, Sidney, Puttenham, Nashe and Webbe, those authors alone excepted who were Meres' actual contemporaries. A comparison made between a single English author (Shakespeare for instance) and some classical predecessor is only of value if the particular point of the comparison is made obvious; the vague comparisons made by Meres tell us nothing. His moral tags come where we can trace them from Mirabellus' *Polyanthea*, his quotations from the same or from Erasmus' *Adagia*.

Mr Allen has done his task very well and certainly cannot be accused of cutting difficulties: on the contrary his solutions of some of the difficulties of the book provide him with some of his most interesting pages. His reprint of Meres' *Poetrie* occupies only 20 out of the 158 pages of his book. He has four Appendices: the first, on Renaissance Grammar Schools and their curriculum, is based largely on Mr Leach's contributions to the Victoria County Histories; it is followed by a valuable bibliography of Latin quotation books of the sixteenth century. More objection may perhaps be raised to the fourth, a Short History of the Classical Scholarship of England in the sixteenth century, which shows a tendency to depreciate English scholarship beyond its deserts and to exaggerate the decay of learning at the close of the century. Mr Allen relies on some doubtful authorities for his history of the professors of Greek at Cambridge and has not consulted the Cambridge Calendar, which knows

nothing of 'F. Wilkinson' for example. The Notes that follow contain some strange forms, as for example 'Ovid from *Sulmone* a town of *Pelignus*', 'Vergil called *Partenna*', 'Q. *Horace Flaccus*', 'Callimachus, an opponent whom he calls *Ibni*', 'Edes' Iter *Borealis*', 'Cn Naavius's native land was *Campanus*', 'Hipponax of *Ephesus*'. Scaliger's complaint, p. 26, was probably against the English pronunciation of Latin.

But a book with so many solid merits and so many signs of industry must be forgiven for an occasional slip.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD

*The Mythical Sorrows of Shakespeare.* By C. J. Sisson (From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. xx) London: Humphrey Milford. 1934. 28 pp. 2s.

In the latest of the British Academy's annual Shakespeare lectures Professor Sisson protests with learning and wit against the recurrent practice of dramatising the poet's spiritual life. The Nazi Shakespeare of a recent Jahrbuch and the 'victim of seventeenth-century blues' are as wide of the mark as the Romantic hero 'moving from mood to mood' out of the bright sun into the valley of the shadow and out of that into sunshine again and a 'resigned imperturbability'. All these examples of 'The Liberty of Interpretation' derive, one suspects, from a naive dogmatism to which are prone both the academically critical mind, too often with little or nothing to go on except a sterile objectivity, and the mind of the poet-critic, which is apt to function with a fertile but irrelevant subjectivity. That is the great critical dilemma; and it has resulted time and again in minimising Shakespeare as an individual, ignoring the freedom with which artists create, or attempting to equate a series of almost naturalistic plays with an undivulged inner life.

Against the biographical follies of nineteenth-century criticism Mr Sisson delivers a swashing blow. Shakespeare's breadth and sanity and disinterestedness he proves backwards and forwards. Not content with setting forth the essential soundness of the 'bitter' comedies, he turns to the last group, the plays 'of convalescence and cure', and finds them quite of a piece with the rest, replete, for all their serenity, with 'ugly facts and ugly thoughts'. 'If we must look', he remarks, 'for weariness and lack of mastery of circumstance, we might well seek them rather in the Romances than in *Lear* or *Othello*.'

It is possible that in redressing the balance Mr Sisson has left his thumb on the contrary scale. 'Shakespeare was of us' is no doubt absurd, and it may be that Whig history has as he suggests been a millstone round our necks. But the plays are wonderfully impartial, and the figure conjured up at the close of this discourse is a pretty Tory and Churchly figure. Shakespeare was like most of the great dramatists in being optimistic about human nature, as Mr Sisson well says, he keeps 'the very flag of humanity flying'. The *non-sequitur* comes in the identification of this humanism with 'the essentially Christian spirit of the tra-

gedies'. For 'a transcendent faith in God' has to be read into the plays quite as arbitrarily as a susceptibility to 'seventeenth-century blues'.

The Shakespeare of the plays, the only Shakespeare we know, evidently accepted the universe, but against his being an enthusiastic conformist it is possible to cite at least as many passages. He 'rose', says Mr Sisson, to tragedy, and indeed he was not 'stung into it' by a Dark Lady nor by the fall of Essex. Yet he rose through swirls of the dunest smoke of hell. Something enforced him to express our universal pain, something more than a merely literary impulse of emulation, something more than the competitive requirements of his company. These may explain why he turned to the tragic *form*; they are not enough to account for the tragic *passion*. At any rate, we may be sure of this. Mr Sisson is right in holding that *Lear* and *Macbeth* are not tragedies of a mythical Jacobean pessimism. Neither were they composed in the offensively robust mood of Robert Browning's most famous lyric. They are the work of a great friend of man at close grips with the same fundamental and inescapable facts that absorbed the attention of Sophocles.

HAZELTON SPENCER.

BALTIMORE.

*Italian Popular Comedy. A Study in the Commedia dell' arte, 1560-1620, with special reference to the English stage* By K. M. LEA. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1934. 2 vols xi+336 and 361 pp. 40s.

A comprehensive and well-documented account of the *Commedia dell' arte* has been for some time one of the chief desiderata of English students of the drama; and it is fortunate that the task of providing it should have fallen into the hands of a scholar so competent and industrious as Miss Lea.

The moment has been well chosen for such an undertaking. Croce's researches into the history of the Neapolitan theatre and its masks—extending over more than forty years; Mortier's *Ruzzante*; Petraccone's invaluable collection of documents and texts, the French translation of Miclachevsky's work (appropriately dedicated 'Au plus grand Comédien de notre temps, Charles Spencer Chaplin'); and Ferdinando Neri's brief but important *Scenari delle maschere in Arcadia*—to name only some of the most recent and outstanding works—have provided a mass of new knowledge which, taken together with the earlier collections of *scenari*, whether MS. or printed, demanded a fresh critical survey and that the result should be made known to English readers. Above all, the methods of the *Commedia dell' arte* required to be made plain in the light of this fuller survey, and something of its Protean character set out for the benefit of those denied access to records still not easily consulted.

The nature of the problem has determined the treatment and method of approach, and Miss Lea has done well on the whole to postpone the attempt at historical reconstruction until she has given a full account of the material on which the historian has to work. An investigation into the *Commedia dell' arte* must partake of the nature of archaeological

research, since all that remains of its once exuberant life—its masks and *scenari* and collections of *lazzi*—are but the cast-off clothes in which it once gambolled and rioted and exulted. One thinks of Pirandello's conception of life as a perpetual flux, and of the characters in his dramas which embody for a moment some portion of the unresting flow. So the masks of the *Commedia dell' arte* existed not in their own right, but as compartments in which the spirit of the genre was momentarily lodged, and whose boundaries it might at any instant overflow. For it is one of the many paradoxes of this type of drama that the very rigidity of its forms encouraged the free play of personality, so that the mask will sometimes be forgotten in the individuality of the player, and sometimes 'non si saprà più quale sia il vero e quale il fittizio'. And as with the separate figures, so, too, with the *Commedia dell' arte* as a whole, the contours are continually shifting. *Commedia buffonesca, istrionica, di maschere, all' improvviso, a soggetto*: the *Commedia dell' arte*, as Miss Lea says, 'will not keep still within the bounds of a definition. To stickle for improvisation as the distinguishing feature leads to the exclusion of a group of printed plays which undoubtedly belong to its tradition. To track it by the appearance of the masks causes confusion, for many are to be found straying into the sub-plots of literary drama, or into masquerades and burlesque poems that have no direct connexion with the stage. To describe it as popular comedy entails an explanation of its resemblance to the neo-classical drama and its cult at the French, Spanish, English, and Bavarian courts. But since these exceptions do not occur simultaneously, the *Commedia dell' arte* may be said to exist by virtue of a quorum of its characteristics'.

In this confusion of outlines, when precise definition is impossible, it is necessary to select some central *point de repère*, from which investigation may proceed, and for this Miss Lea has chosen that which is to be found in 'the first description of a performance of an Italian improvised comedy' which is also 'the most satisfying and self-contained', that, namely, which occurs as part of the description of the festivities for the wedding of Duke William of Bavaria with Renée of Lorraine in the spring of 1568, published in the same year by Massimo Troiano, a Neapolitan musician at the Bavarian court. This was already used by Signor Petraccone as the introduction to his selection of *scenari* published in 1927, but it is a convenience now to have most of it translated into English. The play in which Troiano took part was performed by Orlando di Lasso, the Duke's organist, and a group of Italian musicians and buffoons, assisted by some amateurs who, at this time, like Salvator Rosa in the following century, occasionally took part in such performances. Most of the former seem to have been already in the Duke's service, but in later entertainments at the Bavarian court travelling comedians appear to have joined in the performances. There was thus a combination of professional and amateur talent, although, as Miss Lea remarks, the performance described by Troiano is 'joyous with the zest of surprise and the vigour of the amateur'. There is already, too, the characteristic blend of racial and provincial masks, the Venetian Pantalone (played

by Orlando, a Fleming<sup>1</sup>), the Bergamask Zanni, the rustic 'as from Cava', the jealous Spaniard and his servant, and a Frenchman, not to mention the lover and the courtesan. Music naturally was given a prominent place in such a cast, while the gymnastic element, always considerable in the *Commedia dell' arte*, demanded that the Zanni should spin his master round his shoulders like a cart-wheel, and that Pantalone should do the same in turn for Zanni. There is the familiar farcical element in the talk of 'maccheroni and patties', and the link with classical comedy in the disguising and the appearance of a coffer which Pantalone fails to lift. A delightful supplement to Troiano's narrative is provided by the reproductions Miss Lea has given of a series of frescoed panels of Pantalons and Zanni which Duke William had painted in 1576 on the walls of his castle of Trausnitz.

The masks of the *Commedia dell' arte* fall into the time-honoured groups, common to Latin comedy and the Italian *commedia erudita*, of old men, servants, *milites gloriosi* (differentiated in the *Commedia dell' arte* into *capitan* and *bravi*), and local types. Of these Miss Lea seeks to build up a composite portrait in her admirable second chapter. She recognises to the full the truth which Ferdinando Martini expressed, writing to Croce on Dec. 20, 1898: 'agli argomenti con i quali dimostrare impossibile la definizione dell' indole di Pulcinella nessuno potrà obiettare. Quella è la verità; e lo stesso potrebbe dirsi d' altre maschere p. es. di Stenterello, dato per sciocco, mentre è talora argutissimo.' This multiplicity of traits, as Miss Lea shows, resulted inevitably from the 'self-appointed limitation' of the mask. 'As a mask represents a collection of individuals, so the idea of a mask emerges from a study of individual presentations. The mask of Pantalone is the abstract of the behaviour of innumerable Pantalones: anything that a Pantalone did or said is a potential, anything that he continued to do or say is an actual, formative influence towards the development of the mask. The character of a personage in literary drama exists as an actuality, the character of a personage in masked and improvised drama as a potentiality. We only want to know what Pantalone did on a certain occasion in order to enrich our idea of what he might do in the future. Facts give us his habits, and habits his tradition. It follows that the quality of evidence is for once less important than the quantity.'

While accepting the view that Pantalone is a Venetian offshoot from the venerable tradition of the old man of Menandrian comedy, handed down through the 'senex' of Plautus and Terence, the 'Pappus' of Atellan and the 'Casnar' of Oscan farces, and their descendants of the *commedia erudita*, the author holds, justly we think, that in the case of his foil, Graziano the Doctor, 'everything points to the development of the mask from a character sketch rather than from a dramatic type'. The Pedant, on the other hand, is undoubtedly a creation of the *commedia erudita*. 'He strays on to the popular stage over the borderland where the *commedia erudita* and the *Commedia dell' arte* merge, in the plays of Calmo, Della Porta, Verucci, and G. B. Andreini.' As for the thra-sonical Captain, there are, as Miss Lea reminds us, only too many

originals 'both on and off the stage', from the classical Pyrgopolinices down 'through a grotesque muster-roll of fantastic names' until we reach the famous Capitano Spavento del Vall' Inferno—that 'great glaring dandelion that seeded itself over the later comedy'. This mask, as is well known, was the creation of Francesco Andreini, and in his astonishing *Bravure*—clearly of the same century as Burton and Urquhart's *Rabelais*—the Renaissance seems to discharge all its rhetorical fireworks in one last, great ironic shower.

With the Zanni, on the other hand, the real linch-pin<sup>1</sup> of the *Commedia dell' arte*, we come into close contact with the earth. There is fortunately no doubt either as to his origin or the meaning of his name. Although he inherited all the functions of Davus, his immediate models were the Bergamask 'facchini' who swarmed in Venice and other towns of Northern Italy, and his name, despite its frequently suggested likeness to 'sannio', is merely the dialectal pronunciation of Gianni (dim of Giovanni). Miss Lea points to a record in Sanudo's Diary of a 'comedia alla bergamasca' performed at Venice in 1530, but of this we have no detailed information. What seems certain is that the Zanni made no mark in drama 'until Calmo saw the possibilities of giving the Bergomask dialect to his intriguing servants, Saltuzza, Brocca, and Scarpela'. In Calmo's plays, and especially in *Il Saltuzza* and *La Spagnolas*, 'the Bergomask type serves his apprenticeship to neo-classical comedy. He was found apt and from this time on extreme shrewdness is as much his characteristic as extreme stupidity'. Once launched on his career, whether on the stage or the piazza, the Zanni swept into his orbit a whole world of activities. Unlike the servants of the *commedia erudita*, as Miss Lea points out, his 'original independence as a "facchino" keeps him free for the sub-plot', and he becomes in turn mountebank, lover, pilgrim, Turk, Leno, parasite, and a score of other personalities. Above all his gift for parody enabled him to mimic any situation of the other characters, and to burlesque their high-faluting terms, their salutations, and their oaths, or, as Drayton puts it, speaking ironically of Coryat,

Thou art the Fowler, and dost shew us shapes,  
And we are all thy Zanies, thy true Apes.

A faculty so engaging could not be confined to one province. Hence the extraordinary variety of this type of mask, a variety both individual and geographical. Of most of those types for the earlier period of the *Commedia dell' arte* Miss Lea gives a summary account. Of others which belong to a later period, such as Stenterello, the apotheosis of the Florentine popolano of the humblest class, a record will be found in Appendix E, 'Masks and Actors'. Of the two most famous developments of the Zanni mask, however, Arlecchino and Pulcinella, we have a longer account, incorporating the latest conclusions of research. Driesen's learned and laborious treatise *Der Ursprung des Harlekin* (1904) traced the name back to that of the leader of a mediæval demon-pack (*famula Herlichini*), who may or may not have been the same as Dante's Alchينو

<sup>1</sup> Or perhaps we should say 'the Atlas', remembering that 'his staple occupation is always to carry heavy weights'.

(*Inf.* xxi, 118), and gave strong reason for believing that the French form of the name (Herlequin, Harlequin), coming down in association with the comic devils of the miracle and mystery plays, imposed itself finally on the *Commedia dell' arte*. But the first mention of Arlecchino among the Zanni dates only from 1584, and it is difficult to believe that he ever inherited much from mediæval tradition but the name. On the other hand, Miss Lea makes out a good case for regarding the mask as practically the creation of Tristano Martinelli (brother of the older but less distinguished Drusiano Martinelli, who visited England in 1578). As for Pulcinella, despite his possible or problematic affinity with the Maccus or *mmus albus* of Atellan comedy, it seems best, with Croce, to take him also as a fresh creation of the *Commedia dell' arte*, and the invention of Silvio Fiorillo, famous as Captain Mattamoros. This does not, of course, necessarily rule out the opinion, held by Scherillo, that the actor, who was also a playwright, may have modelled the part on some peasant buffoon of the piazza. In any case, once given the freedom of the stage, Pulcinella, as Miss Lea remarks, showed 'an uncanny faculty for naturalisation', and his popularity both at home and abroad 'hastened the disintegration of the *Commedia dell' arte*'. As ivy the tree, so he first kills the *Commedia dell' arte* and then supports it when the sap, the *vis comica*, is dried up'.

The thoroughness which the author has brought to her task may be well seen from the description and analysis of some seven hundred Italian scenari embodied in chapter III (pp. 129-220). Of these, and of others she has not been able to examine personally, a hand-list is provided in Vol. II, App. F (pp. 506-554), and this and the contents of the other appendices will be found not the least useful portion of the work. Down to the end of the seventeenth century, the *scenari* was generally known as the *soggetto*, and is defined by Perrucci as 'the scenic fabric woven from an "argomento", to which is added the description of an action marked out into acts and scenes, which is to be spoken and presented extempore by the performers'. It is thus distinguished both from the 'argomento' proper, or *favola*, which is found both in printed plays and with certain pieces of the *Commedia dell' arte*, and from the prompters' 'platts' found among the Henslowe Papers. In her examination of the MS. scenari Miss Lea makes out a good case for the independence of the Corsini miscellany, which Valeri believed to be merely a redaction of the Locatelli collection. One of the numerous collections of scenari, that of Flaminio Scala (1611), is unique in two respects: it was the only one which appeared in print while the *Commedia dell' arte* was still in its heyday, and it is also, as Miss Lea points out, the only one 'which appears to be completely independent of written drama'. But though no original has been found for any of the forty-eight plays in Scala's *Teatro*, the great majority follow the Plautine tradition, with the superimposition of the new masks of Pantalone, Arlecchino, Captain Spavento, and Graziano, while the remainder embody tragic, fantastic, and pastoral elements, much of which might be drawn from contemporary literature. A similar background existed, in fact, for the bulk of the *Commedia dell' arte*, as

is proved by Miss Lea's analysis of the other scenari, group by group. A special interest attaches to this part of her investigations, for hitherto we have had no comprehensive and accurate statement of the relations between the *Commedia dell' arte* and the contemporary literary drama. By far the larger number of the scenari take up the motives of the *commedia erudita* and reduce them to farce 'At the hands of the professional comedians', says Miss Lea, 'this drama met the fate that it deserved. It had never been the comedy for poetry, and its prose was staled by repetition, the *Commedia dell' arte* rendered it in dialect and slang. The academic comedy was treated joyfully, irreverently, and whisked into a new lease of life.' When the Spanish drama became popular, it gave rise to a separate class within the *Commedia dell' arte*, the mark of which was a closer adherence to literary originals. Of the nineteen Spanish pieces among the scenari examined by Miss Lea, for which an original is known, most prove to be faithful précis of the written play. 'The intricate plots worked out by Lope de Vega, Mira de Mescua, and Calderon did not allow the improvising players much scope for deviation, the path is too dangerous and exciting to attempt short cuts or excursions'

Imagination had more scope, however, in another form which is among the most interesting creations of the *Commedia dell' arte*, the contamination, namely, of Arcadian pastoral with the masked comedy, and especially with the humour and horse-play of Zanni and buffoon. Out of this developed a whole group of scenari 'delle Maschere in Arcadia', of which 'the scene is laid on the coast of Arcadia or in a lost island inhabited by nymphs and shepherds who have wholly forgotten their sheep in the unhappiness of their love-affairs. The Magician who broods apart is averse to these wooings and practises enchantment to avert the marriages which portend the end of his dominion: he conjures up his familiar spirits, devils, satyrs, or demons dressed as nymphs, and orders them to hang up the magic garlands which cause unexpected love or loathing towards the wearer'.

When the buffoons come to Arcadia, it is either to trade with the peasants, or as the result of a shipwreck. The latter is the more usual, and then we have the horrors of the tempest described, the monstrous and sensational entrance of the troop, their life and adventures on the island, and their relations with the Magician. Finally 'the spells are undone, the lovers are sorted out as the lost children of Pantalone and Graziano, and sometimes of the Magician himself', who declares that his empire is at an end, and takes farewell of his art.

'Italian "literati"', says Miss Lea, 'made a pleasure-ground of Arcadia. Pantalone, the Zanni and the Doctor invaded it like a picnic party.'

For many readers the most important chapter in the book will be that on 'The *Commedia dell' arte* and the English Stage' (pp. 339-455) with which the second volume opens; and they will approach it with all the more expectation because of the impressive display of scholarship which has preceded it. Another student, Miss Winifred Smith, in her pioneer work, *The Commedia dell' arte* (New York, 1912), after a first



survey of the field reached the conclusion 'that while there was a distinct influence of the Italian on the English drama it was, as with Molière, more general than special, and that there is little to be gained from forcing into the same category things essentially so different'. In the main Miss Lea is of the same opinion 'Judged', she writes, 'by a study of particular plays it appears that the contact between the English stage and the *Commedia dell'arte* was considerable but that the Italian influence was mainly sporadic and superficial. Artistically it is almost negligible. It can hardly have been with any illusion as to their artistic quality that English playwrights drew on the scenari. It is of small importance that the plots of fourth-rate plays such as *Jack Drum's Entertainment* in all probability were borrowed from an equally crude tradition of Italian farce. Haste or poverty would press the dramatist to use this seasoned timber as a convenient scaffolding for the support of the younger growth of poetry and satire while the English comedy of manners was still immature. Whereas, at the other extreme, in plays like the *Tempest*, the Italian material, if we may change the figure, is so transmuted by Shakespeare's heavenly alchemy that we need to imagine an earlier version to point out traces of that alloy that "maketh the metal work the better".'

There is abundant proof that the principal masks of the *Commedia dell'arte* were known to the Elizabethans, and that they were familiar with the technique of improvisation, even though 'the best Elizabethan opinion was unfavourable to the lax Italian custom'. (Miss Lea shows herself aware, incidentally, that this custom was not always so lax, but involved, as has been said, 'un addestramento tecnico, mimico, vocale, perfino acrobatico, e alle volte con una preparazione culturale'.) When we recall the impression made some years ago by the visits of Grasso and the Sicilian players to London, we may be inclined to believe that the historians have given too little weight to the possible effect exerted by the early visits of Italian 'comici dell'arte' to England, whether singly or in troops, more especially since those visits were not confined to the capital but extended also to the provinces. It is true that our knowledge of those early performances, after the most laborious research, is still regrettably scanty, yet it may be more than a coincidence, e.g., that both Kemp and Tarleton, who were more akin to the tradition of the *Commedia dell'arte* than any other actors of their time, had associations with Norwich, and that it is from Norwich that we have the earliest and also apparently the latest records of visits of Italian players. In any case, it is undeniable that many of the *burle* and *lazzi* of the professional Italian actors are reproduced with very slight alteration on the English stage, and while, for example, to quote Miss Lea, 'by status the Dromios of [*The Comedy of Errors*] are the slaves of Latin comedy, . . . in behaviour and misfortunes they are the servants of the *Commedia dell'arte*. They are beaten as regularly as any Zanni and for the same reasons'.

With the plots or scenari the case is more difficult. It is not only that the scenari of the *Commedia dell'arte* so often reproduce the situations

of the *commedia erudita* that it is impossible to be sure from which source a suspected case of borrowing may derive. But we know so little of the real conditions of intercourse between the Italian and the English stage, and of the number of scenari available to the English playwright, that we have a further reason for walking warily. In the case of dramatists like Munday and Marston who are known to have had connexions with Italy, a fuller knowledge of Italian stage-practice might be looked for, and it is significant that they furnish us with two of the undoubted instances of a debt to the *Commedia dell' arte*. But even in plays for which a literary original is known or suspected, the characteristic ethos of Italian popular comedy will sometimes make itself felt, suggesting that the influence was more widespread than we are able definitely to assess. Confining herself, however, to plays in which the spirit of the *Commedia dell' arte* predominates, and for which no known original has been discovered, Miss Lea takes for analysis the following six pieces: *The Wit of a Woman* (anon.), Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money*, *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, Barry's *Ram Alley*, Greene's '*Tu Quoque*', and Taylor's *The Hog hath lost His Pearl*. In all of these, despite the English manners and setting of five of them, both the structure and details belong in the main to the tradition of the *Commedia dell' arte*. Each is composed of 'a cast of Italian devices', and much interest is to be derived from Miss Lea's skilful comparison of motive and situation with those she has studied in the collections of scenari.

The caution shown by Miss Lea at each stage of her long enquiry will lend added weight to her support of Professor Neri's opinion that *The Tempest* is related to the 'shipwreck-pastoral' of the *Commedia dell' arte*, the group of plays represented in his *Scenari delle Maschere in Arcadia*. It is impossible here to summarise her arguments completely, but it must be said that it is difficult to avoid sharing her conclusion, even though, as she believes, we must postulate some unknown intermediary, also in scenario form. As she points out in her earlier chapter on the scenari, the intrusion of buffoonery upon literary pastoral was a new dramatic creation of the *Commedia dell' arte*. The shipwrecked buffoons 'encroach upon the love-plot, and their hunger thrusts them upon the Magician. First they are his victims; in *Il Mago* and *Arcadia Incantata* they grow bolder and inhabit the temple'. In other scenari 'they make common cause with the shepherds to kill the Magician and steal his book. The latter plot is thwarted by the Magician's foreknowledge, and when he has had his revenge. He decides to relent . . . renounces his art, breaks his rod, and not infrequently agrees to go back to Venice with the travellers'. 'If', says Miss Lea, 'we could see filmed first the *Tempest* and then one of the Italian scenari, so far as the action and essential stage effects are concerned, there would be little to choose between them'.

In a book of this sort, embodying the work of years of research and full of names and facts, proof-reading must necessarily be a heavy and laborious task, but there are signs that it has in some instances been taken too lightly. Thus there is a certain inconsistency in the spelling

of proper names, e.g. Genova at pp. 270 *et seq.* but Genoa on p. 285; Locatelli at pp. 133 *et seq.* but Loccatelli on p. 331, while in chapter vi Kempe alternates with Kemp, Tarlton with Tarleton, and Barrey with Barry, sometimes within the space of a single page. Forms, too, like 'Sienna' and 'Macchiavelli' (p. 253) read strangely in a book of this kind. Attention may also be drawn to a number of misprints or slips of another kind. On p. 114 (second line from the foot) for 'lead' read 'led', p. 117 (l. 17) for 'The affair Lucca' read 'at Lucca'. On p. 156 it is misleading to speak of Annibale Caro as a 'friend' of the eighteenth-century D. Placido Adriano Priest of Lucca: his *Gli Straccioni* is of course a comedy of the sixteenth century. Again on p. 209, footnote, for 'Comunale' read 'Comunale', on p. 213 (l. 23) for 'Piazzo del Popolo' read 'Piazza', on p. 229 (l. 1) for 'hereditary' read 'heredity'. On p. 290 there is the unfortunate expression 'inflicting the Duke of Mantua with a seven-page letter'; while on p. 331, last line, 'for' should be omitted before 'historically'. In vol. II, p. 366, for 'Corteggiano' read 'Cortegiano', on p. 427 (l. 13) there is a word omitted after 'young' ('to the young who openly flouts him'), while on p. 444 (l. 23) 'irrelevant' should surely read 'relevant'. The Index, too, leaves something to be desired, both in fullness and accuracy.

JOHN PURVES.

EDINBURGH.

*The Metaphysical Poets, Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Traherne.* By J. B. LEISHMAN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1934. 232 pp. 10s.

The purpose of Mr Leishman's book is to introduce his readers to the four poets whom he chooses to represent the metaphysical style. As he explains in his second chapter, that on George Herbert, the reading of poetry is at best an uncertain and difficult business, its success

depends upon what must always be relative, the sensitiveness and sympathy of the reader and, in some measure, the range and nature of his own experience. It seems foolish therefore to neglect whatever may increase sensitiveness and sympathy or supply deficiencies in experience.

He attempts to supply these deficiencies by writing a short biography of each poet, by giving selections from their prose writings and those of their contemporaries and by selecting from their poetry. The whole is set in a framework of his own commentary.

The method is admirable for the lecture room; but, like all teaching methods, it is beset with pitfalls. In his chapter on Donne Mr Leishman falls into some of them. There is first of all the difficult question of how to relate Donne's poems to his biography. It is easy to agree that the poems are not (or are not all) 'to be regarded as mere *jeux d'esprit* or *academic exercises*'. But when Mr Leishman goes on to suggest that Donne 'means what he says' in the same sense as Wordsworth means

And 'tis my faith that every flower  
Enjoys the air it breathes,

his reader may well grow uneasy. Many of the *Songs and Sonets* and of

the *Elegues* are dramatic poems. In one, *The Breake of Day*, the protagonist is a woman. It would be rash to assume that in every other case the protagonist is John Donne and that the sentiments expressed and the incidents implied are a part of his biography. But that is what Mr Leishman does assume. The way in which the selected poems are subsequently introduced implies that we know when, and about whom, they were written. The occasional use of such a phrase as 'seems to have been written at this time' will not be enough to safeguard an unwary reader against the implications of such introductory remarks as 'then come a group of poems in which...' with its strong suggestion of a known time sequence. Nor does it safeguard Mr Leishman himself, for we find him ascribing particular poems to particular occasions without any evidence and sometimes without much probability. For instance, on p. 13, it is suggested that *His Picture* was addressed to the same woman to whom he subsequently wrote *Elegy VII*, and on p. 35 it is supposed that *The Sunne Rising* was 'addressed to Anne More after he had discovered true love'. This is rash conjecture; and, if it is intended to be no more, that should be explicitly stated. In any case conjecture of this kind is fraught with danger, it is so easy to forget that there is no evidence. On p. 19, after a series of such guesses, Mr Leishman concludes that

At one time, then, he really thought that there was such a thing as true love and faithfulness in woman, that there was something in the chivalrous devotion of Spenser and the sonneteers. Then he was deceived, was for a time inflamed with hatred and bitterness, but gradually developed a cynical philosophy of love; resolved to get what enjoyment he could out of it, but not let it unduly disturb his peace of mind.

There is no evidence for the time sequence here assumed.

In his effort to make all plain Mr Leishman is in the habit of prefixing brief prose summaries to the poems he selects. This also has its dangers; not all his readers will agree that what his prose states is really the gist of the poem. His paraphrase of *Aire and Angels* for instance (p. 44), seems to me to bear little relation to what Donne has written in the poem. Mr Leishman's reading leads him to the conclusion that 'Here Donne seems to regret the existence of that physical basis of love which elsewhere, as we have seen, he accepts as a necessary condition'. I do not believe that any such regret is expressed in the poem, on the contrary to me it seems that Donne accepts the 'necessary condition' here as unreservedly as he does in *The Extasy*.

But since my soule, whose child love is,  
Takes limmes of flesh, and else could nothing doe,  
More subtile than the parent is,  
Love must not be, but take a body too.

The poem is an account of his search for the true object of his love:

Twice or thrice had I loved thee,  
Before I knew thy face or name.

When at last he found her he realised that she was too bewilderingly and variously beautiful for her physical presence to be the object of his

love The burden of such beauty instead of ballasting the ship of love  
would

Sinke admiration,

and he finally concludes that the object of his love is not these

things

Extreme, and scattering bright, . .

but love itself, her love for him

So thy love may be my loves spheare

The image of the Angel who

face, and wings

Of aire, not pure as it, yet pure doth weare,

is an explanation by analogy of how this may be This reading differs from Mr Leishman's at several points. Perhaps after all we must each be left to interpret Donne's poems for ourselves as best we can

The most valuable chapter in Mr Leishman's book is that on Henry Vaughan. He has explored the contemporary prose writers in such a way as to bring out the originality of Vaughan's, and of Traherne's, conception of childhood (he contrasts them for instance with John Evelyn), and, on the other hand, by skilfully chosen extracts from the writings of Thomas Vaughan, of the Cambridge Platonists and of Sir Thomas Browne, he shows how much support Vaughan had in his own age for the belief that

all the vast expence

In the Creation shed and slaved to sence  
Makes up but lectures for his eye, and ear.

JOAN BENNETT.

CAMBRIDGE.

*Four Metaphysical Poets, Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Crashaw.* By JOAN BENNETT. Cambridge University Press 1934 135 pp. 6s.

It is sixty years since John Richard Green defined 'metaphysical' poetry as 'the vigorous and pithy expression of a cold prosaic good sense' which 'began with Sir John Davies and buried itself in fantastic affectations in Donne'. The *Golden Treasury* in 1861 contained not a single lyric by Donne. Of recent years the tide has flowed overwhelmingly in the opposite sense, and the metaphysicals, most of all Donne, have captured not only the imagination of a younger generation of lovers of poetry, but also the critical taste of those best capable of judging, by virtue of scholarship as well as of impressibility. For scholarship, in the dual sense of learning and of capacity for thought, is in fact necessary to the full understanding of Donne.

Mrs Joan Bennett fulfils all the necessary conditions in her contribution to the now continuous stream of appreciation, interpretation, and analysis. She has rightly insisted upon the application of the term 'metaphysical' in its literal sense to the poetry she is examining, especially in reference to Donne, being careful to restrict that application

to its style and manner. Its intellectual strength is its keynote, and logic its strenuous rhythm of thought.

A robust dialectic is the most constant feature of Donne's poetry as of his prose (p. 20)

I find in Mrs Bennett's book a solid foundation of good sense, allied to an obstinately successful preference for judgment at first hand. Her attitude might well be prescribed, given of course the necessary basis of learning, to followers of fashions in criticism to-day. She faces the apparent obsession of Donne by images of dissolution, but is aware of the prevalent interest in physiology of the poet's age, and consequently is not led into the fallacy, not uncommon to-day, that here was a morbid kink in Donne's mind.

Mrs Bennett might perhaps have pressed further the parallel hinted at, in this connexion, between Donne and the dramatic poetry of his contemporaries. There is much food for thought here.

The remaining essays are also of considerable interest, as for example in the comparisons of Herbert with Donne and with Hopkins, and in the penetrating comment upon the danger of the metaphysical style to the different constitution of Crashaw (p. 107). I do not, however, attach psychological significance, as Mrs Bennett seems perhaps to do, to what she describes as his 'collocation of torture and erotic emotion' (p. 99). Is this not part of the sublimating process of imagination inevitable in the ardent, celibate Catholic poet? And here is perhaps something of a footnote to the excellent concluding chapter upon the relations of religious poetry to the convictions and experiences of its readers, with which I cannot wholly agree.

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

*Boswell's Life of Johnson together with Boswell's Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides and Johnson's Diary of a Journey into North Wales.* Edited by GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL, D.C.L. Revised and enlarged edition by L. F. POWELL. In six volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1934. Subscription price, six volumes, 105s.; vols. 1-4 separately, 84s.

Two editions of Boswell's great biography of Johnson appeared in the lifetime of the author; a third followed in a few years, and in every format, at every price, editions have succeeded in an unbroken series. No biography has attracted so many outstanding editors—Malone, Croker, who 'greatly disappointed' Macaulay, Napier, and, chiefest of all, Birkbeck Hill. The edition of Birkbeck Hill, published in 1887, deserves the misused epithet of monumental. It has long taken its place as the edition to which scholar and student must refer. The literature surrounding this edition, citing it by page and footnote, has spread far and wide. It was no longer possible to disturb it without throwing into confusion an immense tract of printed matter. The latest editor was, therefore, not only confronted with the task of revising Birkbeck Hill, but of introducing his additional matter without displacing the edition

of 1887 for purposes of citation. This is a problem which editors need hardly ever contemplate. With the help of the printer Mr Powell has succeeded in solving it triumphantly. His edition of Boswell corresponds to Dr Hill's page by page exactly as to text, and as nearly as may be as to the footnotes.

In a paper read to the Johnson Club over six years ago Mr Powell stated the principles he had adopted to guide him. The first has been indicated. This can have been no easy task. The text of the work was a comparatively simple matter, but the difficulties with which the printer had to contend in setting up the commentary have left their mark in a few dropped letters and dislocations of type. When the nicety of adjustment required is considered perhaps the wonder is that there are not more of these slight blemishes. A good example of the difficulties which had to be faced occurs at III, 405-7. Here it was necessary to note the now famous cancel relating to conjugal infidelity, first detected in 1929. In both editions, at the foot of p. 405, the notes begin in correspondence. Before reaching p. 406 they have parted company completely; by the end of p. 407 they are again running neck and neck. On p. 406 Mr Powell has added two new notes, one of considerable length relating to the cancelled passage, and adapted the space content by removing to an appendix some 'further particulars' about Johnson's places of residence. These continuous readjustments must sometimes have strained to breaking-point both editor and printer.

An editor's duty to his author's text was imperfectly appreciated when Birkbeck Hill was at work. He rightly adopted the text of the third edition; but, though he recognised some of its shortcomings, his collation of the preceding editions was inadequate. The third edition was never seen by Boswell. It contained, however, his final additions. It must, therefore, be accepted as the basis of the text content, although many errors, some startling, crept into the second edition and were reproduced in the third. Mr Powell also adopts the text of the third edition, correcting it, however, by the first and second, giving the variants when he departs from the third. A full list of variants will appear in the sixth volume, when published.

Dr Hill's edition was immeasurably superior to any which preceded it in the wide research of commentary and footnotes. But nearly fifty years have passed during which much has been learned of Johnson and his contemporaries, and the science of bibliography, almost a discovery of our times, has thrown light into dark corners. Dr Hill continued his researches; Mr A. L. Reade has pursued his gleanings; Mr R. B. Adam, Dr R. W. Chapman, Professor Tinker, Professor Pottle, and Geoffrey Scott have added largely to our knowledge of Johnson and his biographer, and W. P. Courtney's bibliography has been revised and extended by Professor D. Nichol Smith. Mr Powell has the advantage of all their labours, and his own researches, continued over twelve years in the direct preparation of this edition, are not less important. A reckoning of the enlarged commentary, by a mere count of additional pages, is impressive, but this is far from giving a true appraisal. The content

of Dr Hill's notes has been constantly improved in minute details which appear only upon close collation. Quotations have been checked, references more fully given and brought to date, essentials pared away. These improvements are not apparent at a first glance, for Mr Powell has treated his predecessor with respect. Definite additions to the notes are enclosed in angular brackets, or, when lengthy, printed in appendixes. All this involves a craftsmanship and technique in the art of dovetailing which is a marvel of neatness, finish, and utility.

Dr Hill's allusions to books by title and his method of citation are, judged by the bibliographical standards of to-day, sometimes crude and faulty. Mr Powell is more exact, and he corrects inaccuracies or misconceptions. A pertinent example is the interesting new light he has thrown on the editions of Lord Grimston's absurd play, *The Lawyer's Fortune*, and the legends attaching to it.

Another great stride forward is the large number of new identifications of persons to whom Boswell alludes under general and indefinite designations or descriptions. His own references to himself in the third person have been marked down, but Mr Powell adds another veiled allusion to the list. Boswell was, and he is only just to himself, 'the man who had been guilty of vicious actions'. The maligned Croker was the first editor who attempted seriously to follow up the slender clues offered by Boswell, and much has been done since, but Mr Powell has the credit of adding about one hundred new identifications. Nine of these were made while the volumes were in the press, and too late to appear in their proper places. The value of these discoveries in the by-ways of literary and social life, as Johnson trod them, can hardly be over-estimated.

Dr Hill's edition of Boswell, an outstanding example of patient and sound scholarship, has proved a storehouse of information to the student of the eighteenth century. Nearly two generations of research have beaten upon it and left not only the foundations but the main edifice unshaken. Despite many additions and the introduction of modern improvements the building remains and the greater part of its contents. If, therefore, Mr Powell's edition of Boswell, supplements, and indeed supplants that of Dr Hill, it may also be regarded as a fine tribute to the memory of a great scholar.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

ASPENDEN, HERTFORDSHIRE

*Johnson's England. An Account of the Life and Manners of his Age.*

Edited by A. S. TURBERVILLE. 2 vols. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1933. xxiii + 405; ix + 404 pp. 42s.

Works on eighteenth-century life in England are fairly numerous; but the good ones have usually been restricted to one aspect of it, and those that dealt with the period as a whole have not been equally well-informed on all points. Now for the first time we have an account of eighteenth-century life and manners that is at once full and authoritative. The period covered by these two volumes is roughly the last fifty years of Johnson's life (he died in 1784); and though certain chapters might have



been more interesting, as well as easier to write, if their authors had been free to draw upon the first thirty years of the century for some of their material, the resulting survey is far more satisfactory than anything of the kind hitherto published. Not only does it offer a pleasant introduction to the life of Johnson's day for those who knew little about it before; but it also adds—and quite considerably in such chapters as those on the Navy and the Newspaper—to the existing knowledge of the subject.

A work of this kind must owe a lot to its editor, and Professor Turberville has done his part well. It would be difficult to improve upon his choice of contributors. Some of them, no doubt, such as the late Sir John Fortescue for the Army, Mrs George for London and the Life of the Town, Dr W. J. Lawrence for the Drama and the Theatre, were inevitable choices, but though the different sections vary in their usefulness, each has been entrusted to a recognised authority, and each, in varying degrees, is readable. There is little trace of overlapping in the different chapters, and, with one exception, no important omission. The omission was deliberate: there is no section on Politics. No doubt the political scene may be studied elsewhere, and it would have been difficult to deal adequately with eighteenth-century politics in a single brief chapter, but the omission does to some extent rob Professor Turberville's picture of its dominant colour. To write of Johnson's England with hardly a single reference to Whigs and Tories is surely to run some risk of doing what the editor himself deplores—viewing the period 'too much from the standpoint of present conditions'.

Of the individual chapters that on the Church is one of the least satisfactory, partly, one suspects, because the subject is so large. One would have welcomed, however, more information about the Dissenters, and similarly in the chapter on Education (which ought to be one of the most interesting and is not) some further light on the dissenting academies and the charity schools would have been useful. In the chapter on Drama there might well have been some discussion of the provincial theatres, and even of the strolling players. There are also two small points in this chapter which may prove misleading. It is dangerous to challenge Dr Lawrence on points of theatrical history, but is he justified in stating that 'the after-piece, as a convention, dated only from the second decade of the eighteenth century'? It was certainly fairly common some time earlier (e.g. the last act of Mrs Centlivre's *Love's Contrivance* was frequently given in this form between 1703 and 1705); but Dr Lawrence would perhaps deny that it was common enough to be styled a convention. Again, one would like some authority for the statement that 'the copyright of a damned play was valueless'. Did the publisher wait until the play had been performed before he made a contract with the author? It is true that on Feb. 16, 1729, Joseph Mitchell assigned his opera, *The Scotch Fair*, to John Watts with the following proviso 'Memorandum, In case the within mentioned Opera shou'd not be Perform'd at the Theatre Royal in Lincolns-Inn-Fields in the month of November, December, January or February, 1730 I promise

to pay back to John Watts the Sum of Thirty One Pounds Ten Shillings upon his delivering up the assignment of the said opera' (B M. Add. MSS 38,728, f. 155). But here Watts was apparently protecting himself against loss from publishing a play which he had reason to suspect might never be performed. The normal practice seems to have been quite different. Plays were frequently published almost immediately after their first performance, and it can only be assumed that the author had secured his agreement with the publisher before it could be known whether his play would be damned or not. The agreement for Martyn's *Timoleon* is dated Jan 22, 1730, but the play was not performed until Jan. 26. Similarly James Ralph's agreement for *The Cornish Squire* is dated Jan 1, 1734—two days before the opening night (B.M. Add MSS. 38,728, f. 141). The chapter on the Law—in spite of the fact that Mr Justice Mackinnon was called upon to contribute it at short notice—is one of the best-written and most interesting of all. One small correction is required on p 306. John Matthews, the printer, was duly hanged, but was not (as one might gather from the report in *State Trials*) quartered as well. The sentence for high treason was passed on Matthews, but he was told by the Lord Chief Justice that he would not be quartered upon which he is said to have remarked, 'I thank you, my Lord, a very easy sentence' (P R.O S P D. xix, 47, and *Mist's Journal*, Nov 7, 1719).

The value of this work to the general reader is greatly increased by the generous allowance of illustrations from contemporary sources, and the student will further profit from the carefully compiled bibliographies at the end of each chapter. Finally, it is pleasant to see Johnson himself not wholly obscured by his England. Each chapter begins with one or two quotations from his own writings or Boswell's biography. It is a measure of the variety of Johnson's interests that those quotations should be invariably appropriate to the occasion.

J. R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

*S. T. Coleridge's Treatise on Method*. Edited by ALICE D. SNYDER, with introduction, manuscript fragments, and notes for a complete collation with the essays on method in *The Friend*. London: Constable. 1934. xxviii + 92 pp. 6s.

This little book is a threat to the spare time of anyone who is attracted either by the history of philosophical thought or by the tragic drama of a great mind. The *Treatise* itself and the unique 'encyclopædia' to which it belonged are interwoven with the logic and metaphysics of Coleridge's intellectual life, and Miss Snyder's editing affords abundant guidance to relevant sources, the result is that the reader is likely to have recourse first and of necessity to the corresponding essays in *The Friend*, then to biographies of the author, to Professor Muirhead's *Coleridge as Philosopher*; and to what is the richest single aid, Miss Snyder's earlier book *Coleridge on Logic and Learning*. He might easily then be led to journey at large in other works of Coleridge himself, philosophical or quasi-philosophical, desisting only when time failed. For the little treatise

carries a host of challenging assertions, raises no end of questions logical and metaphysical as well as educational, and involves the most grandiose conceptions. One does not wonder that John Stuart Mill pronounces Coleridge 'the greatest seminal mind of his time'.

In spite of all this Coleridge cannot be said to have any clear and firm place in the history of philosophy, it is a fair guess that nine-tenths of those who know *Kubla Khan* and *The Ancient Mariner* have never thought of the magical poet as also profound philosopher. To the present reviewer one mournful question stands out—if the artistic genius which created these poems and the metaphysical and logical powers which are unmistakably evident in the philosophical remains could have been concentrated in either field—and preserved from the deplorable effects of ill-health and opiates—what momentous addition might have been made to the enduring body of humane culture? One feels that the spirit which produced *Kubla Khan*, even as a fragment, might have created the supreme imaginative poem of the ages; so in the philosophical work, even in this short treatise, one comes upon insights, keen critical perceptions, hints at vast structural organisation, passion for 'method' and system, he should have been the great post-Kantian—Kant was his master—but transcending Kant's pedantic rigour, and avoiding the cloudiness of Fichte, Schelling, Hegel. But it was not destined to be: in his philosophy nothing was finished, all left in 'fragments,' some as splendid as *Kubla Khan* itself, but still fragments.

The story of Coleridge's connexion with the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, as told by Miss Snyder in her Introduction, is sadly characteristic. Coleridge had conceived the idea, which was nothing less than magnificent: the new encyclopædia was to be no mere aggrandised dictionary, its contents illogically arrayed in alphabetical succession; it was to be 'an entirely new Work, intended to be Methodically arranged'; a difficult undertaking indeed, but not impossible, 'we trust,' the Treatise continues, 'that we have found a clue to the labyrinth in those considerations which we are now about to submit to the reader' (p. 1). In sum the new work claims to be called 'a *METHODICAL Compendium of Human Knowledge*' (capitals and italics as in the original).

Coleridge was to have superintended the whole publication, and also to have contributed the treatise on grammar and the English lexicon (p. vii). But he fell out with the publishers almost at the start; the *Encyclopædia* passed out of his hands; even the Treatise which he had written was 'rearranged, interpolated and "bedeviled"' (Coleridge's own indignant word) by the editors (p. xxiii). Thus the *Treatise*, as printed in the *Encyclopædia* and now reprinted, is and is not Coleridge's. After the break, Coleridge worked most of the material of the Treatise into the essays on method in *The Friend* (Section II, Essays IV to XI). Miss Snyder deals faithfully with the problems involved here, providing fully, as the title-page indicates, for the collation of the two versions; the problem of the authenticity of the *Treatise*, she holds, 'has received surprisingly little careful consideration'; the bulk of her Introduction and of her annotations are intended to furnish means for further investi-

gation. An Appendix contains illuminating items. the proposed table of contents and the prospectus of the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*, and five manuscript fragments by Coleridge on *method*.

As philosophy, the *Treatise* cannot be greatly valued, it stands too much in need of method itself to be a guide to method for others. For the student of Coleridge, and especially of his philosophical significance, this book is indispensable; yet even so, Miss Snyder's earlier *Coleridge on Logic and Learning* is far richer in subject-matter, and has the great superiority of undoubted authenticity.

EDWARD O. SISSON.

PORTLAND, OREGON, U S A.

*Old Icelandic Sources in the English Novel.* By RALPH BERGEN ALLEN. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania 1933. pp. 121.

After some general considerations and a chapter of thirty-one pages on translations and scholarly works dealing with Iceland, the subject of the thesis is discussed in sixty-five pages. In this survey Dr Allen has brought together some useful information. Especially does he deserve commendation for his sketch of Icelandic scholarship in England and America and also for the full account of Maurice Hewlett's novels with Icelandic themes.

Some additions may be suggested. Among modern versions of tales about the old Norse gods mention should be made of Juha Goddard, *Wonderful Stories from Northern Lands*, London, 1871. In the literature of the sagas relating to the discovery of America Fridtjof Nansen's *In Northern Mists*, London, 1911, should be noticed, and in considering the influence of the sagas on Scott, Miss Edith C. Batho's article, *Sir Walter Scott and the Sagas* (*Modern Language Review*, October, 1929) might be included. Moreover, when allusion is made on p. 41 to well-known modern works inspired by the sagas, John Masefield's *The Locked Chest* ought not to be overlooked.

Objection may be taken to the phrase 'the old Norse werewolf idea' (p. 72), which seems to imply that this superstition was peculiar to Norse literature, and the view expressed by Dr Allen that Tegnér added little but poetic diction and imagery to the old saga about Frithjof can only be based on a superficial acquaintance with his poem. We cannot agree either in thinking that when Maurice Hewlett attributed his failure to complete *The Song of Man* not to want of courage but to want of brains, he was displaying any particular naiveté. Nor is this the only occasion on which we are left with some doubt concerning the justice of the author's opinions. Thus on p. 74 we find that though Dr Allen has been unable to obtain Hodgetts' *Champion of Odinn*, he nevertheless declares that 'there is no reason to believe it much different from his *Kormak the Viking*.' The style of the thesis is frequently careless, uncouth and even ungrammatical. The following instances out of a large choice will suffice. pp. 26-7: 'The scope evidenced . . . and the excellence exhibited reveal a wide acquaintance. . . .'

p. 49 'The sagas supply Whistler with facts of Cnut and his accession

p. 67 'An admirer might be chronologically forgiven . '

p. 74 'This Vedic and Oriental scholar tells the tale with skill and imagination and as a border-line work is noted here.. '

The use of accents is neither consistent nor accurate. If we are to have Eiríkr Magnússon, the quantities in Arngrímr Jonsson and Vigfusson should also be marked, and if we are to write Thóroílf (not Thórólf, p. 33), we should also write Skallagrím (not Skallagrim, p. 33) and Kári (not Kari, p. 20, n. 37). In this connexion a score of errors might be pointed out.

Garðarsee (p. 17) is unintelligible and should read 'the see of Garth', while 'Fornmannasogur' does not mean 'foreign men's sagas' (p. 67), but 'sagas of the ancients'. By 'a somewhat gentling age' (p. 57) presumably 'a somewhat gentler age' is intended, and 'strong a man and brother' (p. 85) should be 'strong as man and brother'.

Matter relating to the work of Reeves, Eddison, and Collingwood and Stefánsson (p. 31 and n. 79, p. 33, n. 88 and p. 38) is later repeated (p. 68 and n. 11, p. 66, n. 9 and p. 88), and an equally undesirable repetition is brought about by the summaries at the end of each chapter, which in their turn are summarised in the 'Conclusion'.

It is regrettable that a university with such traditions of scholarship should permit the publication under its ægis of a book disfigured by such blemishes as those indicated above.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

BANGOR, NORTH WALES.

*Longinus and English Criticism.* By T. R. HENN. Cambridge: University Press. 1934. 163 pp. 6s.

It must frankly be said that this little book is in great part disappointing and none too safe a guide for the students of English for whom it is designed. It was not necessary for Mr Henn to dwell on Plato and Aristotle at all, for the doctrines of his author owe little to either: his approach is from a different angle. But Mr Henn concerns himself with both, and often misinterprets them. He does not always refer his students to the best authorities or appear to rely on them himself. Bywater stands in a class by himself as an exponent of Aristotle's *Poetics*, but Mr Henn seems to be unacquainted with him, and Aristotle's theories and terms are imperfectly explained. It may be doubted too whether Mr Henn's dealings with psychological influences, and the strange diagrams on pp. 129 and 134—in which criticism seems hardly justified of her children—will do much to help students. It is all too disjointed and spasmodic, and is likely rather to bewilder them or to foster in them pretentiousness rather than scholarship.

We could wish that all this part of the book were washed out and that Mr Henn had confined himself to a task he performs well, the exposition of the teaching of Longinus and its illustration by passages of English literature, a match, as near as may be, to those which Longinus took

from Greek. There is no great subtlety in Longinus, if we must still so miscall the unknown author of the work. Gibbon and Fénelon have expressed in simple language, which could not easily be bettered, the nature of his appeal, and if Pope had not been misled by the supposed romantic fate of the critic, and had written, 'Whose own examples strengthen all his laws', he might be added to the number. Occasionally we note in Longinus a wandering off into byways and an over-particularism, which are characteristic of the age in which he wrote. But his supreme excellence lies in this, that his reading had given him so sure a sense of what we would call inspiration, and, for the most part, so unerring a judgment in illustrating it and in detecting the defects in what falls short of inspiration. He is at his greatest in his masterly analysis of a famous passage in the *De Corona* of Demosthenes, and Mr Henn is at his happiest in quoting as a parallel Lincoln's famous address at Gettysburg. When Mr Henn is content to explain and not to over-explain Longinus, to illustrate him and to consider analogies to his teachings without carrying him into regions in which he is not at home, we can have no quarrel with him.

LAWRENCE SOLOMON.

LONDON.

*Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature.* By Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan Press. 1933. vi+278+x pp. \$2 50.

This, the tenth volume in the *Language and Literature* section of the University of Michigan Publications, opens with the third of a series of essays by Mr Oscar James Campbell and Mr Paul Mueschke on Wordsworth's *Æsthetic Development*, which they here trace from the time when he had finished *The Borderers* until the publication of the second edition of *Lyrical Ballads*. In spite of the researches of Professor Harper and Professor Beatty, we still have to rely a good deal on speculation in considering Wordsworth's early development, and, although the two Michigan critics are on firmer ground than in their earlier essays, they, like others—like all of us—are not free from the temptation to choose that interpretation of the scanty evidence which will best support or supply a neat theory. Thus in the first paragraph, and again on p. 7, the reader is arrested at once by the phrase, 'remorse for his treatment of Annette Vallon': had Wordsworth any reason for remorse on that account, and did he in fact ever feel it? *Repentance*, perhaps—but the critics are not thinking theologically. Whatever the right word may be, it is not *remorse*. Too many critics do not seem to have recovered from the effect upon them of Professor Harper's biographical researches sufficiently to be able to remember that Wordsworth was, after all, a normal human being, and that there were many things in his mind besides Annette Vallon and the French Revolution. It is impossible here not to enquire why, if 'the question whether or not [the Lucy] poems reflect a real experience with a real girl is, for the purpose of this study of Wordsworth's æsthetic development, of little or no importance' (p. 37),

it should be necessary to hang on to Annette Vallon every poem in which a mother, deserted or not, appears. If Wordsworth was free enough in his mind to 'invent' Lucy, and capable of inventing her, he was free enough and capable enough to invent a good deal more.<sup>1</sup> And, in fact, the authors try to have even the Lucy poems on both sides of the argument: on the next page the 'attentive ear can discern' in the poems 'faint echoes of the grief and remorse [again *remorse*!] that the poet felt for the loss of Annette Vallon and her daughter'. There is elsewhere an occasional pressing and exaggeration of the evidence which arouses uneasiness, e.g. in the discussion of the date of *Peter Bell* (pp. 16-17), and, perhaps less excusably, in the last sentence of the footnote on p. 49: 'Remembering the reputation for semi-atheism which Wordsworth enjoyed with his friends during the years 1797-1802, we should not expect Wordsworth to attach the religious significance to "animism" that Coleridge did.' Is there any evidence at all that Wordsworth enjoyed such a reputation? Coleridge, in one letter of 1797, applies to him the phrase, 'at least a semi-atheist'; Coleridge's meaning is at the best uncertain, and one ambiguous phrase in one letter of 1797 ought not to be extended to cover Wordsworth's general reputation among his friends during the succeeding five years. In the main contentions of the first part of the essay we may cordially agree with the authors: that Wordsworth's development was not spasmodic, that he did not sweep his mind clear and start again with a completely new set of ideas derived from Coleridge, but that old modes of thought persisted and found their place in 'a larger æsthetic synthesis', and that his poetry is 'the product of a great diversity of experiences and a large number of artistic traditions and methods' (p. 40). We may also give a general assent, reserving details which need not be noted here, to the contentions of the second part, which deals with the *Prefaces to Lyrical Ballads* and brings out their originality and their curiously exact anticipation of modern metaphysics and æsthetics. But it ought to be added that the authors have not cast their net widely enough in the first part, and that, in particular, we do not know enough, if we shall ever know enough, of Wordsworth's life and thought between 1789 and 1797 to be able to pronounce with exact certainty upon his psychological processes.

Mr N. E. Nelson follows with an essay on *Cicero's 'De Officiis' in Christian Thought. 300-1300*, and points out its direct influence on such men as John of Salisbury, and its more extensive indirect influence through Christian adaptations such as that of Ambrose. 'Even in the Dark Ages,' as he remarks in his conclusion, 'there were men who tried to bridge the gap between utter righteousness and the world of reality', and Thomas Aquinas himself did not refuse to be instructed by the *De Officiis*. Mr H. T. Price has now succeeded in tracing the earliest sermon 'taken by Characterie', and discovered it in the possession of Sir Leicester Harmsworth: it was preached by Stephen Egerton at Blackfriars, printed from a shorthand version in 1589, and reprinted in

<sup>1</sup> And to adapt common material: the 'deserted mother' is one of the most widespread of ballad themes, for obvious reasons, and Wordsworth was experimenting with ballads.

a version corrected by Egerton in 1603. Mr Price compares the two versions, and concludes that that of 1589 is what it declares itself to be, taken from a shorthand report, not from Egerton's MS., that the report was made by Bright's system, and that it was good enough to serve as the basis of the corrected version. Mr Karl Litzenberg, in his paper on *The Social Philosophy of William Morris and the Doom of the Gods*, works out Dr J. W. Mackail's suggestion of a connexion between Scandinavian myth and Morris's theory of social change, a matter of considerable interest and importance for the understanding of Morris's thought. Mr Warner G. Rice studies the early English travellers to Greece and the Levant, particularly in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, without being able to indicate any direct Hellenic influence through them, but suggesting that their activities 'worked widely if often invisibly for the dissemination of a knowledge of, and an interest in, Hellenic antiquity.' Finally, Mr Harold Whitehall is able to prove that Thomas Shadwell, who was obviously interested in dialect, had a first-hand acquaintance with the dialect of South Lancashire, and that he acquired it during his visit to Sir Edmund Ashton in 1671.

The volume suggests that the members of the English Department of the University of Michigan have sufficiently varied interests to be able to staff a college without much additional assistance.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

*From Latin to Modern French with Especial Consideration of Anglo-Norman. Phonology and Morphology.* By M. K. POPE. (*Publications of the University of Manchester*, No. CCXXIX. French Series, No. VI.) Manchester: University Press 1934 xxix+571 pp. 10s. 6d.

The reviewer of this scholarly book cannot do better than begin by congratulating the author on the completion of a task which must have called for exceptional perseverance and attention to detail, and the publishers on having successfully produced a volume which, in view of its technical character and typographical complications, could not have commended itself as an attractive business proposition. Its bulk alone—six hundred large pages of small type interspersed with hundreds of sections in still smaller type—may convey some notion of the fulness of the information Professor Pope supplies on the development of French pronunciation and flexions down to the end of the sixteenth century. The development of the French language beyond this point is indicated in connexion with many of the phenomena discussed, but it was a trifle unfortunate to introduce the adjective 'modern' into the title, raising the expectation, as I believe it must, that the nineteenth and twentieth centuries represent the lower limit of the field to be studied in detail. It is a matter for regret that Professor Pope has not in fact brought her account down to the present day, or at least to the middle of the nineteenth century. Students are already too prone to consider that philology is concerned only with dead languages or with Old French, Old English, etc.

Part I gives a full account of the external history of the French



language down to 1600, the differentiation of the *Langue d'oïl* from the *Langue d'oc*, the formation of standard French and the sixteenth-century attempts at regulating usage. The changes in vocabulary, borrowings from Franconian, Provençal, Italian and Latin are traced in some detail, and the relevant political and social developments are indicated clearly and concisely. Here and there the need for concise statement has perhaps militated against clearness. Thus, it is not clear exactly what the term 'Late Latin' denotes. We are told that French and all the other Romance languages are derived from Vulgar Latin (defined elsewhere as colloquial Latin) but we are not told whether the term 'Late Latin' refers to a stage in the evolution of Vulgar Latin, or embraces something more than colloquial Latin, or what its relation is to the written texts of the period. The subsequent history of French proper is divided into two periods, each of which is subdivided into two. Period I into Gallo-Roman (500-850) and Early Old French (850-1100), Period II into Later Old French (1100-1300) and Middle French (1300-1600). The dates I give are of course approximate. Particularly welcome features in this Part are the indication, at the conclusion of each chapter, of the sources of information for the period in question and the clear account of the activities of sixteenth-century grammarians. There is no doubt an unintentional exaggeration in the statement that Montaigne made little or no attempt to avoid provincialisms (p. 37), just as there is in his own statement on this point.

Part II is devoted entirely to Phonology and begins very appropriately with a phonetic introduction in which the sounds of Old and Modern French are described and classified. The phonetic symbols used are those approved by the Copenhagen Conference of 1926. Unfortunately the recommendations of this Conference were not unanimous upon all points and have not been accepted, in practice at any rate, by Romance philologists. The student is therefore asked to familiarise himself with yet another system. This is hardly the place to discuss the system in detail, but the difficulties it creates for the printer and the proof-reader are serious and conducive to error (p. 48, l. 18, etc.), while its use in writing requires a sure hand in the writer and a fine discrimination in the reader. Thus, the distinction between the velar nasal and the palatal nasal depends upon a very slight difference in the length of the final (looped) down-stroke of the symbol *n*.

There are one or two points upon which the reader is left in some doubt. When the vowel symbols (particularly *e*, *o*, *ø*) appear without diacritic signs, it is not clear whether the quality is intermediate or merely uncertain. Nor is it clear on what principle the indication of length in Latin and French vowels is indicated or omitted. The sign used is the macron, but it is frequently omitted and occasionally a single dot is used to indicate half-length (cf. the transcription of *païlle*, *cher*, etc., on p. 55). The use of the capital *R* to indicate the uvular pronunciation might have been dispensed with in the phonetic transcriptions and the modern pronunciation (and its distribution) disposed of in a note. As it is, the student may be misled by such inconsistencies as *emprunter*

transcribed with *r* (p. 54), *cher* transcribed with *R* (p. 55). The asterisk is used in a way that will prove disconcerting to those accustomed to its normal significance in philological works. It is used in the body of the work with Latin words to indicate 'that the word or form is Late Latin, attested or conjectural', with Germanic words to indicate that they are conjectural; while the double asterisk indicates a conjectural Gallo-Roman form. But in the Index a single asterisk denotes a Late Latin or Germanic etymon, while the double asterisk denotes a dialectal variant, and in the Tables (pp. 236 ff.) a single asterisk distinguishes those Late Latin forms or phonetic transcriptions which are conjectural (*\*levnarum*) from those which are attested. In the body of the work itself we find such inconsistencies as *illum* > *\*illy* (p. 89) and a few lines lower down *illy* > *\*ello*. It would have been better to use the asterisk to denote a conjectural form and other devices to denote the various stages in the phonetic evolution. The development of *pelerin* is given (in italics) on p. 63 as O.F. *pelerin* < *\*\*pererinu* < *\*peregrinum*, and on p. 133 (in phonetic script) as *pelerin* < *\*\*pererin* < *peregrinum*, but there is no indication that *pelegrinum* is an attested form. The tonic accent is usually indicated by a preposed perpendicular dash (p. xviii) but sometimes by an acute accent (e.g. p. 318). There are various definitions which might have been phrased more clearly or in more explicit terms. 'Out of air constricted or stopped at some point of its passage through the throat or mouth are developed the consonants' (p. 51). On p. 52 it is inadvertently stated that the lifting of the tongue and the opening of the mouth ordinarily go together. The vowel *u* is omitted from the table on p. 52. Two *j* symbols are used, one with the dot, the other without, and it is not clear what difference, if any, there is between them. The beginner might wish for a clearer definition of semi-vowels and semi-consonants. According to p. 53, *w* is a consonant, but on p. 56 it is described as a 'fricative bilabial consonant or semi-vowel'. A diphthong is described as the combination of two vowel sounds in one syllable, but the symbols *ɨ* and *ɥ* (semi-vowels) are often used to denote one of its elements. A falling diphthong is described on p. 58 as one 'in which the first element is the more sonorous', but on p. 104 as one which is 'stressed on the first element'. It is in connexion with the discussion of diphthongs and hiatus that one regrets the absence of any definition of the syllable (the word finds no place in the Subject Index), for the syllable is after all the phonetic unit of speech-activity, not vowels and consonants (cf. particularly E. Herzog, *Historische Sprachlehre des Neufranzösischen*). The phenomena of elision, syneresis, enclisis, and above all liaison, are difficult to explain unless the principles of syllabification are invoked. Similarly, the distinction between 'double' consonants of the type *là-d(e)dans* and lengthened consonants of the type presented by the *p* in *épouvantable* pronounced with 'emotional' stress hinges on the question of syllabification (p. 61).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Here and elsewhere there is some confusion between two different things, sentence accent (or the normal 'accent d'intensité') and what is in French called the 'accent d'insistance' (cf. the reference to Grammont given on p. 60).

The pages (66-71) devoted to the definition of sound-change contain many interesting observations but will leave the reader in some doubt as to the precise meaning attributed to this term, particularly as it appears to be used somewhat loosely in other portions of the book to denote all changes in pronunciation. The reader is told (p. 67) that the normal sound-changes are gradual, and he is led to suppose that there are others (abnormal) which are sudden, but in the next paragraph he is told that such sudden changes are sound-substitutions. As the question is discussed in some detail, it would have been well to distinguish clearly between the actual phonetic process and the generalisation of the change within the speech-community, and also to discuss the question of extension of sound-change by analogy.

I do not wish to exaggerate the importance of these details, but they are of some consequence to the beginner and might receive consideration in a second edition. They do not affect the accuracy of the information conveyed nor the clearness of the exposition as a whole.

The remainder of Part II, extending to 200 pages, is devoted to the phonetic changes which have transformed Latin into French and which the French language has undergone down to the seventeenth century. A preliminary chapter gives a chronological tabulation of sound-changes with references to the following chapters (III-XVI), in which they are discussed in detail under the various phonetic headings, Isolative Changes, Influence of Stress, Palatalisation, etc. The development is thus envisaged from the point of view of the phonetic processes involved, the effects of each process being traced throughout the history of the language. There is much to be said for this method, but it means in effect that upon the horizontal divisions (Late Latin, Gallo-Roman, Early O.F., Later O.F., Middle French, Modern French) there are superimposed a series of vertical divisions. I am not sure that the effect on the student will be altogether happy, for the historical development is thus sacrificed to phonetic analysis and a vast number of cross-references have had to be employed. Apart from this general criticism, which does not detract in any way from the purely scholarly value of the book, there can be nothing but praise for the thoroughness with which the operation of the various phonetic changes is worked out, for the completeness of the author's documentation and for the excellent use she has made of illustrative texts and statements of grammarians. The student's attention is directed to the spoken word of which the written is but an imperfect symbol, and to this end the phonetic transcriptions are distinguished by a heavy black type, italics being reserved for the ordinary or contemporary spelling. Separate chapters are devoted to Syntactical Phonetics and to the treatment of loan-words, and full tables of vowel and consonant changes complete this section of the book.

The chapters on Orthography trace in detail the changes in spelling and the use of diacritic signs down to the end of the seventeenth century. The chapters on Morphology give a very full account of the flexion of substantives, adjectives, pronouns and verbs, in which the author is primarily concerned to account for the phonetic development and ana-

logical re-modellings of the various forms, their use being considered only in so far as it governs the formal evolution. Dialectal variants receive special consideration, and there can be few points upon which the student will not find full information in these crowded pages. A very useful table of verbs, in which non-attested forms are carefully distinguished by an asterisk, completes this section. The full paradigms given in the course of these chapters should prove useful, but it was, I think, inadvisable to seek to convey quite so much information in them, particularly as the author has on occasion been constrained to employ three different kinds of type, not to mention hyphens and brackets square and round. Under such conditions a paradigm may easily defeat its own end, at any rate for the tyro.

In Part V Professor Pope will be found to have given us by far the best and fullest account of Anglo-Norman that we possess. The unsatisfactory state of affairs in this field, as regards both editions and linguistic studies, is well known. It presents a handicap which could only be overcome by patient personal investigation and collection of materials in many directions, and from this task Professor Pope has not shrunk. Many problems connected either with Anglo-Norman itself or the borrowings into English are here faced for the first time and a reasonable (if not always final) explanation is put forward. What may be called the spontaneous or independent development of Anglo-Norman is considered in the first place under the headings Phonology, Orthography, Declension, Verbs; but full consideration is given to the important questions of English influence and the influence of Continental dialects. The latter is here worked out in detail for the first time. Occasionally one may feel that the author has gone too far in the assumption of Continental influence and that in some cases we have to do with a coincident or parallel development instead of a borrowing. For example, such forms as *chival* (for *cheval*) are ascribed to the influence of the Northern French dialects acting through the intermediary of closer political and commercial relations with Ponthieu and Flanders in the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; but they are found before the middle of the thirteenth century and may well represent a quite independent development, for they are also attested in South-Western dialects. There are points such as this upon which the final word cannot be spoken until more spade-work has been done, until more texts have been edited or re-edited in conformity with the requirements of modern scholarship and a systematic investigation of extant material undertaken. For this work, so long unjustly neglected in this country, the young scholar will now find an invaluable guide in these pages, based as they are upon personal research, the critical examination of a varied collection of texts (pp. 483-5), and a judicious utilisation of the researches of the few but outstanding scholars who have done valuable work in this field.

An Appendix gives a most useful conspectus of dialectal traits grouped under the territorial divisions Northern, North-Eastern, Eastern, East-Central (Champagne), South-Central (Orléanais), Western and South-Western, with references to the relevant sections of the main work,

bibliographical indications and lists of illustrative texts. A map would have formed a most welcome addition. The book concludes with Indexes of French and Latin words, of English words, of Verbs, and of the subject-matter.

Professor Pope's book may be justly described as a book 'by a scholar for scholars', and as such it is sure of a warm welcome from all those who know how to value scholarly methods and the stern scientific discipline demanded by linguistic studies. It is no reflection on its merit as a notable scholarly achievement to suggest that, in a second edition, a few concessions or adjustments on the lines I have indicated might be made in the interests of the *average* student. If such suggestions tend to bulk rather large in the foregoing account, it is in obedience to the duty of a reviewer to help, according to his lights, to make the second edition of a good book even better than the first.

A. EWERT.

OXFORD.

*Étude sur les mots français d'origine néerlandaise* Par MARIUS VALKHOFF.  
Amersfoort: Valkhoff et Cie. 1931 330 pp.

This is the counterpart—by a distinguished pupil—of M. Salverda de Grave's monumental study on the French element in Dutch. The Dutch element in French is much less extensive. The traffic was mostly one way. Nevertheless the Dutch export was considerable, and it provides Dr Valkhoff with ample material for his critical analysis. What he means by *français*, and what by *néerlandais*, he is careful at the outset to explain. The first includes technical French and thus the book contains numerous trade terms, notably those in use in the diamond industry, which is the main source of the nineteenth-century borrowings from Dutch—for historical reasons. Under Louis XIV there were seventy-five expert diamond-cutters in France and, in his somewhat drastic solution of the religious problem, he drove out the whole seventy-five, as Protestants or Jews. In 1775 there were only seven to be found in all France, but in the nineteenth century the deficiency was made up, chiefly from the Netherlands.

By the term *néerlandais* hangs a tale, imperfectly appreciated by non-Dutch lexicographers. It is all very well to turn up likely etymons in the Dictionaries and label them 'O. Fris.', 'Flem.', or 'Du.' The matter does not end there. They may be common to all the Netherlands. Linguistic conditions in the Low Countries are not what from a distance they may seem. They are so complex that even Dr Valkhoff, after explaining them (and making short work of 'Frankish', alias *francisque*), restricts himself, thenceforth, to *moyen-néerlandais* and *néerlandais moderne*. It is only for convenience' sake that he designates as *flamand* any word which seems to belong more specially to the regional *néerlandais* of present-day Belgium and as *hollandais* any word more or less peculiar to the northerly parts of the Low Countries.

Moreover, a scholar who is himself, if not 'O. Fris.', at least 'Du.', often feels in his bones that the proposed etymologies are wrong, that

the Dictionary words can never have had quite the sense that foreign lexicographers innocently assume, and besides, he has learned at school how to spell them. Most delicately and with only a touch of irony, Dr Valkhoff points out that von Wartburg (*F.E.D.*), following Diez, derives *F. ruban* (thirteenth century) from L. Ger. or Du. *ringband*, which is not found in *moyen-néerlandais* and means in *néerlandais moderne* a 'dog's collar', that Gamillscheg attributes *F. hangar* to Mid.-Netherl. *\*ham-gaerd* = 'clôture entourant la maison', whereas *ham* means not 'house' but 'land', that the word giving *F. mannequin* (fifteenth century) is Mid.-Netherl. and is spelled *mannekijn* or *manneken*, whereas the lexicographers are easily pleased—Littré, the D G and Behrens with 'maneken, Flem.', Meyer-Lubke (*R.E.W.*) with 'manneken, L. Ger.' and Gamillscheg with 'manekin, Netherl.' This sort of hereditary *Sprachgefühl* is a valuable possession and lets the owner safely go a little further than the Dictionary. Thus, the special sense of *actron* (1748) = 'share' is attributed by Gamillscheg to Dutch *aktie*. But *aktie* has this sense only in Halma and other modern Dictionaries and strikes the educated Dutchman as a Germanism (*Aktion*). Instinctively Dr Valkhoff rejects *aktie* and favours *Aktion*. The word *berne* in *mettre le pavillon en berne* (1672; *berme* 1728) is connected by Professor Paul Barbier with Netherl. *berm* = 'côté, talus'. Dr Valkhoff accepts this etymology, but has some misgivings as to the alteration of sense and remarks that the Dutch themselves use a quite different expression *de vlag in sjouw* or *halfstok hijsen*. In this connexion it is gratifying to see Professor Barbier's ingenious etymologies held in high honour and very generally commending themselves, notably *béher*, from *béler*, formerly *belér*, and not from Mid.-Netherl. *belle* = *cloche*.

It is in fact no easy matter to determine Dutch origins—to draw a scientific distinction between Germanic words in French that are Netherlandish and other Germanic words in French that are not. Dr Valkhoff does his best—by keeping rigidly to criteria which are sound: a French word which is clearly Germanic, and *may* be Netherlandish, probably *is*, if the proposed Netherlandish source-word has more meanings in common with it than have the other Germanic rivals, or is closer to it in form, or occurs in Walloon, Northern French dialects, or old Northern French texts, or is a maritime term introduced from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century (the palmiest days of Dutch shipping), or belongs to a *catégorie idéale* already known to furnish France with several Netherlandish words, i.e. is the sort of word that the French demonstrably do borrow from the Netherlands.

But, while doing his best, he freely admits in many cases that the honours are easy: *matelot* (fifteenth century) may be Netherl. or Norse; *hallebarde* (1448) and *hase* (sixteenth century) may be Netherl. or Ger. or both, i.e. may have been borrowed by some Frenchmen from Netherl. and by others from Ger.; *ballast* (seventeenth century) and *stopper* (nineteenth century: of 'invisible mending') may be Netherl. or Eng. or both, and the latter may even be Ger. as well; *loch* (seventeenth century) = 'log' (of a ship) may be Netherl. or Eng. (*N.E.D.* 1574), but *loch* was a common

Dutch variant and is not in the *N.E.D.*, and that fact just turns the scale against England. In words derived from Proper Names, there is a pleasing certainty. *Fokker*, type of German aeroplane. Dr Valkhoff gives a very late quotation (1927). *N.E.D.* Supplement gives an earlier English one (1913) and even supplies the Dutch designer's date of birth (1890), *Philips* (wireless valve) '*Ne dites pas une lampe Dites une Philips*', says the advertisement (inventor, Dr A. F. Philips of Eindhoven, N. Brabant), *ripoln*, which might seem an essentially French household word but about whose Dutch origins there is not the faintest doubt named by the inventor Dr J. K. F. Riep (*rip* + *-ol* = 'oil' + *in*), factory built at Hilversum 1886, product christened 1888, imported into France 1893, limited liability company formed 1897, thereafter such universal fame that one President of the French Republic was for his unfailingly spruce appearance dubbed 'M. Ripoln'.

What Dr Valkhoff has done is to collect from the Dictionaries, etc., the French words of all periods which look like Netherlandish or for which a Netherlandish origin has been suggested, then subject them to a strict analysis, reject the dubious claimants, and draw from the remainder what social or cultural lessons they contain. The results are interesting. We see words brought in at varying periods and in various ways: through frontier dialects by enterprising farmers (e.g. *colza*, *houblon*); by traders from Flanders who bartered their wares at Bapaume, till with the progress of navigation in the fourteenth century they took to sending them by sea; by fishermen and fish-curers from the coasts and islands, by Dutch mariners, conspicuous figures in French ports from the fifteenth century; by weavers, and shipwrights imported by Richelieu and the far-sighted Colbert—till, with the peace of Utrecht in 1713, the Dutch star begins to pale before the English one, and the introduction of Netherlandish words to become infrequent.

R. L. G. RITCHIE.

BIRMINGHAM.

*Unpublished Poems by Voltaire, Rousseau, Beaumarchais, Anne d'Urfé, Helvétius, Gresset, etc.* By G. VAN ROOSBROECK. Publications of the Institute of French Studies, Columbia University, New York. 1933. 143 pp. \$1 50.

One may wonder at first what Anne d'Urfé is doing in that eighteenth-century galère. But no one will quarrel with Professor van Roosbroeck for including him; surprise quickly gives way to pleasure as one reads such sonnets as: 'Vanité, vanité...' and 'Je voyois en dormant près de l'onde fameuse...'. *Le Tombeau de Carite* was well worth rescuing from its obscurity in the MSS. department of the Bibliothèque Nationale. The other poems collected from eighteenth-century MSS. miscellanies and rare books several of them in the author's possession, are mostly of documentary interest rather than aesthetic value. Attributions are fully and learnedly discussed, and section IV is entirely given up to a consideration of certain erroneous ascriptions.

The proofs, unfortunately, do not appear to have been read with much care. Besides obvious printer's errors, such as *tu n'est* (p. 26), *syllables* (p. 82), the full stop after *qu'on n'avance* (p. 53), *à toutes les sauces* for *à toutes sauces* (p. 68), the frequent occurrence of lines which do not scan or rhyme is rather disturbing. Possibly the MSS. are faulty, but should not such strange readings be confirmed or emended in footnotes? Whatever the reading given by MS FF. [Fr ?] 12504, Gresset must have intended to write *J'écris le mien sur des tablettes*, not *J'écris* (p. 45) *Tâchons au moins de vivre Avant que de mourir* must be one line, not two (p. 20). One conjectures *cœur* for *erreur* on p. 91, and *Le reste* for *Tout le reste* (or perhaps *estoit* for *c'estoit*?) on p. 90. P. 89, *escoutes-moy, notes bien juges sainement*, should surely be read for *escoutez, notez, jugez*. What is one to make of

Non, non, notre âme ne peut être captive (p. 18),

Un talent étrange dont tu fais ton talent (p. 81),

Ce corps la nature l'avoit fait de sa main (p. 93),

Jouyr de ceste chair et de ces membres si beaux (p. 96)?

Did Gresset rhyme a singular with a plural (p. 49)? Why has *puérils* (p. 24) no fellow-rhyme? Can Voltaire have written

Quand le plaisir nous prie d'être heureux (p. 23)?

H BIBAS.

CAMBRIDGE

*Baudelaire judged by his contemporaries.* By W. T. BANDY. New York. Institute of French Studies. 1933. x+188 pp. \$1.75.

*Baudelaire the tragic sophist.* By G. T. CLAPTON. Edinburgh. Oliver and Boyd. 1934. 60 pp. 2s

Baudelaire continues to attract the attention of scholars in various parts of the world. We have here for review two recent works in English, one from an American, and one from a British university. The former is a work of great patience and devotion since it entailed careful search into the files of French newspapers and reviews of half a century. It is an invaluable production for those who study Baudelaire, and critics who have already written on the poet will regret that they did not know Mr Bandy's book before they composed their own, since it would have saved them hours of often fruitless work. Hitherto little has been known of Baudelaire's reception by his contemporaries; here we see in chronological order the conflicting opinions that were current.

More personal and challenging is Mr Clapton's work and it is one that no student of Baudelaire can neglect to read, whatever views he may hold. The regret that the reader feels is that it is not longer, for many interesting and controversial points are only hinted at, which could with advantage have been amplified with supporting evidence. There is in this pamphlet the substance of a full-sized book. In a larger work, moreover, there would have been space for references to support those statements which are still open to discussion. This lack impairs the value of the book for the scholar, who always likes to refer to the texts himself, since a quotation frequently takes on a different shade of meaning when



viewed in its full context. Some readers will not always admit that Mr Clapton's quotations prove his contentions when read in their context. When, for instance, Baudelaire wrote to Louis Martinet (not Ménard as Mr Clapton says, p 12), 'J'ai pris l'habitude depuis mon enfance de me considérer comme infaillible', the context makes it quite clear that he is writing as an author who objects to the blue-pencilling of his manuscript. This is not a fair basis for an accusation of 'perverse and diseased pride'. Again when Mr Clapton writes (p 13), 'He outdoes Jean-Jacques in his belief in his own rectitude. It is difficult to believe how blind a man may be to his own character, and how forgetful of his own history', the passage he quotes in support is taken from a letter written in 1847 when Baudelaire was only twenty-six years old, and could not yet know how often he was to fail in later life.

As my recent book on the poet has identified me with a view different to the one held by Mr Clapton, and as I hope to revert to this question on a later occasion, I shall content myself here with merely indicating the possibility of a different interpretation.

Mr Clapton's thesis is that Baudelaire is a sophist and casuist. A short review does not allow the space to show that the passages he quotes to prove his contention are capable of another interpretation, and that if these be proof of sophistry then Christ himself with his love and pity for sinners was a sophist too. Moreover it does not seem fair to judge Baudelaire by the generalised christianity of Mr Clapton and to find him guilty of bad faith for the 'partial use he made of christian formulas, for the false use he made of christian language'. Baudelaire never claimed to be a christian and a catholic. He dabbled in many religious doctrines, Illuminism, Swedenborgianism, taking from each what suited him, but he would not have claimed to belong to any of their sects. He would certainly have denied through most of his life that he was a catholic, and he would surely have smiled ironically if Mr Clapton had quoted to him (p 23) what Saint Chrysostom demonstrated to Stagirius. Nevertheless, like most catholics born and bred, he could not shed his catholic psychological make-up when he lost his faith. His sensibility remained catholic even when he no longer believed. Much of what Mr Clapton calls Satanism and deems so significant for Baudelaire would be recognised by catholics as the common form of religious instruction.

Many lines of discussion are opened out by this important and challenging little book, and every student will react to the arguments according to his temperament and his interpretation of the poet. All critics have remarked on the contradictions of Baudelaire's personality, and it is precisely this complexity that makes it difficult for any two readers to agree. Mr Clapton's views challenge argument, but the fact that the present reviewer is unable to accept them in no sense implies a failure to appreciate the value of his work. This review is, in fact, merely a friendly crossing of swords.

ENID STARKIE.

*Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman* Par ALBERT FEUILLERAT  
New Haven Yale University Press, London Oxford University  
Press. 1934 314 pp. 15s 60 francs.

Grâce à des circonstances des plus heureuses, dont on trouvera un compte rendu détaillé dans le présent volume, pp 1-5, nous avons maintenant sur Marcel Proust et sur son œuvre une étude d'une valeur capitale et qui nous contraint à 'réviser la plupart des idées ayant présentement cours sur la méthode de Marcel Proust et sur la véritable originalité de son roman'. Depuis longtemps M. A. F. avait reconnu deux couches de style dans *À la recherche du temps perdu*. Il avait cependant sagement agi en ne publiant pas trop tôt les résultats de son enquête. Sa prudence et sa modération ont été dignement récompensées : elles lui ont permis d'asseoir ses conclusions sur une base objective indiscutable, dont la solidité est autrement sérieuse que celle résultant d'un essai de critique esthétique. Il a donc eu entre les mains quelques placards qui avaient été décrits dans un catalogue de l'hôtel Drouot relatif à la vente, le 10 décembre 1923, de livres provenant de la bibliothèque de M. P. P.. Ces placards étaient numérotés à la presse de 1 à 66, mais M. Feuillerat n'a pu disposer que de 64 d'entre eux, les placards 15 et 16 ayant été perdus. La note du catalogue donnait ce document comme représentant 'la première version de la deuxième et de la troisième partie de *À la recherche du temps perdu*, imprimées à Mayenne dans la typographie de Charles Colm, du 6 au 22 juin 1914, et qui, sans la guerre, auraient paru chez l'éditeur Bernard Grasset, où avait été publiée, en 1913, la première partie de l'ouvrage, *Du côté de chez Swann*'. Et l'auteur de l'article ajoutait : 'Une confrontation des deux versions pourrait faire l'objet d'une étude d'un intérêt considérable. Ces premiers placards représentent la première pensée de Proust, sa manière intime, non modifiée par le souci du public'. C'est justement à ce travail que s'est attaché l'éminent professeur. Il s'est livré à une comparaison entre lesdits placards et les parties leur correspondant dans l'édition courante (en 16 volumes) de la *Nouvelle Revue Française*, et il a 'essayé de reconstituer le troisième volume comme il eût paru chez Grasset, si l'auteur s'en était tenu à son premier projet'.

Sur la reconstitution même du troisième volume il y a bien quelques points où l'on pourrait chercher chicane à M. Feuillerat : mais pour la partie la plus originale de sa thèse on ne se refusera pas à lui donner raison : nous nous trouvons bien en présence de deux styles, et même plus que raison : nous décelons, sans conteste possible, deux Proust, et deux Proust dont les traits accusent parfois de singulières disparates : Proust I, le jeune, et Proust II, l'homme mûr.

Pour Proust I l'amour est une passion peu compliquée, où, naturellement, le doute et la jalousie se creusent leur place, où le cœur se livre à ses intermittences, passion caractérisée par le fatalisme et dont les victimes se contentent de remettre leur sort à la grâce de Dieu (voyez plutôt *Swann* !) et ne songent pas à scruter les répercussions infinies, ni à analyser les sentiments érotiques ou érotophiles qui en rejaillissent sur

leur moi Proust II, lui, y voit une continuelle oscillation entre des désirs contraires, il se complait à y considérer des généralisations de souffrances, des générations de mouvements opposés, il met en relief le besoin constant que l'amant éprouve de voir clair en lui-même, de manœuvrer pour ne pas se laisser manœuvrer, bref, comme on dirait maintenant, de transformer la passion dont il est la proie en une 'passion dirigée'. Proust I se laisse guider par sa sensibilité, ses réactions de demi-réveil, ses impressions fugitives et quasi insaisissables; les individus qui vivent sous nos yeux il les dépeint en esquisses concrètes et en traits pittoresques. Proust II se garde de mépriser l'intelligence; il use et abuse de son sens critique, il recourt aux amplifications et ne résiste pas au vent qui le pousse à 'classifier'. Proust I nous décrit un jeune aristocrate; Proust II nous trace un tableau de l'aristocratie. Proust I, exposant du domaine de l'inconscient, pare sa prose de subtiles résonances, il déroule des phrases 'au long col sinueux et démesuré' qui respirent 'une atmosphère de poésie, la douceur d'un mystère, vestige de la pénombre' où il a dû pénétrer. Proust II reconnaît sa part au positif, à la rude logique, à la dure réalité. Proust I veloute et fluidifie son style, comme il convient à l'expression de vérités sourdant de la mémoire involontaire. Proust II tend à persuader, à entasser arguments sur arguments, et il tombe souvent dans la lourdeur. La plume de Proust I c'est essentiellement l'instinct, celle de Proust II c'est souvent la raison qui la dirige. Proust I fait preuve d'un sens naturel pour la composition, les proportions, la clarté; Proust II marche à la remorque d'ajoutages, de modifications, d'excroissances, et, dirais-je si je l'osais, de 'paperolifications', dont l'ensemble risque de fausser le plan primitif de son roman et d'en briser le cadre. Proust II sourit dans la désinvolture, l'aménité et la fraîcheur de la jeunesse. Proust II, renfrogné et grognon, aigri par la maladie, par les tristes événements auxquels l'a mêlé sa vie courte, mais chargée d'amertume, blasé, désillusionné, méfiant, soupçonneux, s'enfonce dans le pessimisme. Aussi noircit-il nombre de ses 'héros et héroïnes'. Monsieur de Charlus, lui jadis si entiché des 'comme il faut', verse dans la grossièreté; de coureur de femmes, Robert de Saint-Loup devient un homosexuel; le convenu, le banal et le grotesque de M. de Norpois s'épaississent. Proust I était Bergattolâtre; Proust II a des tendances à la Bergattophobie. Proust II détruit les éléments de sympathie que Proust I avait cristallisés autour d'Albertine, de Rachel, de la marquise de Villeparisis; il exaspère les défauts de la duchesse et du duc de Guermantes: il guermantifie la première de façon guermantissime; il façonne le second en une espèce de rustre qui renifle la jouissance toute particulière de paroles hautement (et basement) vulgaires. Proust II semble regretter les hommages dont Proust I avait encensé Madame de Marsantes; cet 'être supérieur, d'une bonté, d'une résignation angéliques', quel mépris Proust II ne lui crache-t-il pas à la face! Que ne va-t-il pas lui reprocher! O crime épouvantable, elle suit les cours de Brunetière, elle est confite en hypocrisie, en orgueil, en fausseté, tout cela à la Guermantes (de nouveau la haine que Proust II tient à manifester pour l'aristocratie en général et pour cette famille-là d'aristocrates en

particulier). Françoise même, l'humble Françoise, écope à son tour et se voit traiter en brebis galeuse.

Voilà quelques-uns des horizons nouveaux évoqués par la baguette magique de notre sourcier. Et avec quelle aise parfaite n'évolue-t-il pas à travers les obstacles qui voudraient s'opposer à son progrès! Formations, déformations, reformatations des théories, des opinions, des croyances, des descriptions, des paysages, des portraits proustiens; déplacements, substitutions, additions, suppressions, il relève, pèse et juge tout inlassablement. Rien n'échappe à sa perspicacité toujours en éveil. Que Proust s'avise, par exemple, de remplacer la quinine par l'aspirine, ou qu'il mentionne les 'boules destinées à éteindre les bruits', voilà deux indices qui serviront à dater deux passages de l'œuvre immense. Contradictions, inconséquences, bizarreries d'un texte aussi composite sont mises en lumière, sans que, d'ailleurs, M. Feuillerat considère ces défauts comme portant irrémédiablement atteinte à la valeur du grand écrivain que fut Proust, ou, si l'on préfère, des grands écrivains que furent les Proust. Ces taches, à son avis, comme à l'avis de tous, n'enlèvent que peu au mérite du chef-d'œuvre. C'est la maladie et la mort qui, trop tôt venues, ont empêché un Proust III de réviser et d'uniformiser le roman, et ce roman, dans son état actuel, représente l'une des productions de génie les plus singulières et les plus originales qui se soient jamais imposées à l'esprit humain.

En somme, le présent ouvrage constitue ce qu'on pourrait appeler le bréviaire du parfait proustien. Pour s'orienter en toute sécurité du côté de chez Proust, il n'y aura désormais rien de mieux que fréquenter assidûment du côté de chez Feuillerat.

LOUIS BRANDIN.

LONDON.

*Heinrich Heines geistige Gestalt und Welt*. Von KURT STERNBERG. Berlin: W. Rothschild. 1929. viii + 346 pp. 14s.

*Heinrich Heine. a critical examination of the poet and his works.* By HERMANN WALTER. London and Toronto: Dent, New York: E. P. Dutton 1930. xii + 322 pp. 12s. 6d.

*Heinrich Heine. Ein Leben zwischen Gestern und Morgen.* Von LUDWIG MARCUSE. Berlin: Ernst Rowohlt. 1932. 326 pp. 12s. 6d.

*Poet in Exile The Life of Heinrich Heine.* By ANTONINA VALLENTIN. London: Victor Gollancz. 1934. 320 pp. 10s. 6d.

*Heinrich Heine.* Von MAX BROD. Amsterdam: Allert de Lange. 1934. 496 pp. 10s. 6d.

The interest in Heine in England and America in recent years is in striking contrast to the attention paid to him in Germany, so far at any rate as we may judge by the literary journals of the period under review. If we take *Euphorion*, for instance, we find nothing more than a few allusions and brief notes, and it is hardly likely that he will receive more attention in the paper under its new and characteristic title of *Dichtung und Volkstum*. *Die Literatur*, again, with one notable exception, contains

only brief references, such as that of Paul Gutmann, in a notice in vol. xxxiii 'Zum 75. Todestag': 'Während die Gedenktage von Geistern dritten und vierten Ranges im Rundfunk als Ereignisse begangen werden, bringen die Atherwellen der deutschen und österreichischen Sender mit Ausnahme des rheinischen, der einige belanglose Gedichte rezitieren lässt, und zwei, drei anderer keine Kunde vom 75. Todestag eines der größten unter den deutschen Dichtern, der von der gesamten ausländischen Kulturwelt geliebt und verehrt wird.' That exception is vol. xxx (1927-8) in which Professor Martin Sommerfeld writes a collective review of *Neue Heine-Literatur*, in which he does justice to two works which lie outside our period—the sterling, scholarly, full-length biography of Max Wolff, with its insistence on Heine's lyric gift as his essential claim to greatness ('Im Lied lebt der Dichter und wird er leben'), and the concise and admirably well-balanced little book of Hartwig Jess in the Reclam series of Dichter-Biographien, with its clear presentation of all the chief Heine problems. What slight attention Heine was receiving a few years ago has, moreover, been submerged by the tide of recent events. Reviewing a translation of Otokar Fischer's *Heine* (Prag 1924) in vol. xxv of *Euphorion*, René Wellek wrote in 1925 'Die engbrüstigen klerikalen und antisemitischen Angriffe sind wohl für alle ernstere Forschung endgültig abgetan.' In 1930 Professor Walter could still say, 'Nowadays a writer of Heine's standing who could be accused of no worse crime than being a Jew could afford to sit back and smile.' But on May 10, 1933, among the books burned by order of the National Socialist Party were the entire works of Heinrich Heine. So, even if the revolution perhaps brought a certain reaction in favour of Heine, his proper official place in literature has now been definitely settled once for all. It is then not surprising that, of the last two books on our list, that by Antonina Vallentin has not appeared in the original German at all, but only in English and French translations, while the work of Max Brod has been published, not in Germany but in Holland.

Kurt Sternberg, in his big book with its resounding title, has made no use of the work of his predecessors in the field of Heine scholarship: he states in fact expressly in his brief preface that he has based his work solely on Heine's letters, together with the Bong (Goldene Klassiker) edition of the works and the introductions to the several volumes of that edition. 'Auf sonstige Literatur habe ich mich nicht gestützt.' Excellent as that edition is, this is obviously a somewhat limited background, and so we are dependent on what he calls the 'Tiegel meiner eigenen Gedanken' for any specific value the book may have. In the introduction, entitled 'Über die Psychologie des Geistigen', we find 'die Prinzipien dargestellt, die Richtlinien gekennzeichnet, welchen die nachfolgende Würdigung Heinrich Heines untersteht'. The standpoint is expressed in the formula 'Dialektik zwischen Rationalismus und Romantik', and that magic formula occurs, as a whole or in parts, on page after page of the work. When the formula is applied to the examination of Heine's individual works the results are very meagre. The essential qualities of Heine's lyric poetry are explained in the following sentence: 'Die Dialektik zwischen

dem Rationalen und dem Emotionalen in dieser oder jener Form ist das, was die Heimesche Lyrik im erster Linie charakterisiert, worin sich die Individualität und Originalität Heines als Lyrikers vor allem zeigen' What a net to catch Heine's music in! This approach prepares us for the commonplace remarks we find on separate poems. As instances we might quote *Die Grenadiere* ('wohl seine mit Recht berühmteste Ballade'), or the string of platitudes on some of the poems of *Romanzero*. Or for triteness his remarks on Heine's use of the *Fremdwort* (p. 16) or the ironic close of his poems (p. 287). There are no illuminating touches, little fresh or original appreciation, and generally a naive restatement of things already said in the works which the author has deliberately omitted to read. Altogether a dull book for all its parade of scientific apparatus.

Professor H. Walter of the Department of Germanic Languages and Literature of McGill University has written a sound solid book about Heine, which is well documented and makes use of the latest sources of information concerning him. Its interest is enhanced by a number of portraits of Heine and other illustrations. In the Preface Mr Walter tells us that his aim is to write 'a critical examination of the life and works of the poet considered purely as a German poet. The question of racial influences, the obsession of a number of German Heine biographers, naturally obtruded itself from time to time in the course of my studies, but was, after careful examination, dismissed as furnishing data too elusive to be of practical use. The environmental influences, on the other hand, have received due consideration.' A study of the work itself would hardly give the impression that the poetry of Heine is the author's chief interest. He writes, for instance, at great length in Chapter xvii on 'Arid Polemics'. Borne gets a whole chapter to himself, and more than three pages are devoted to an analysis of Heine's notorious book about him. No poem or collection of poems receives anything like such detailed treatment. The chapter on *Romanzero* has only a few pages, even including a good deal of quotation. Why this cursory treatment of that collection which Walter himself tells us 'is held by many to be Heine's ripest work'? There is some interesting appreciation of poetic form, but on metrical matters some vagueness. The *Nordseebilder*, for instance, are described as 'an irregular blank verse', and Heine is apparently presented as the inventor of Free Rhythms. 'Before him Goethe had performed wonders in the adaptation of rhythm to thought, but he had rarely ventured outside the strictly defined limits of classical prosody. It required a man like Heine, completely devoid of reverence for accepted standards, to give us this perfect and convincing harmony of thought and form' For all that we are told there, Klopstock and Goethe might never have written their famous odes. On the whole Professor Walter is much fuller and more satisfactory in his treatment of Heine's prose than of his verse. The best things he has to say about 'Heine the Poet' are found in the chapter bearing that title at the end of the book, where certain phases and aspects of Heine's poetic individuality are very effectively presented.

Not only on the dust-cover, but also in other quarters, Marcuse's book, or rather its English translation, has been proclaimed an outstanding

achievement. 'This biography', says the former, 'concerns itself with more than the life of the individual whose name it bears. It gives a brilliant and arresting picture of the historical background. Great figures move across its pages—Napoleon—Metternich—Saint-Simon—Rothschild—and many others.' 'He has written the most interesting life of Heine that we remember to have read', says one critic, and so it may well be for those interested rather in Heine's times than in Heine himself. When we turn to the account of the poet and the man it is a different question. Here the author arrests attention by a sounding phrase 'Man konnte die Legende Heine in einem Satz schreiben: er liebte—und seine Liebe wurde nicht erwidert—und er klagte in Versen—und starb.' There is a fine dramatic unity about that, but how does it accord with the facts? He has just been speaking of the Lüneburg days, and the visit Heine paid while there to Hamburg. 'Nach sieben Jahren unglücklicher Liebe, zwei Jahre nach der Vermählung der unerreichbaren Geliebten, stürzte die alte Leidenschaft nochmals mit Gewalt hervor. Er konnte nicht vergessen. "Was ich liebe, liebe ich für immer"' It is of Amalie that he is speaking. Yet that is the very time when Heine's heart was caught on the rebound and the new passion blossomed forth for the younger sister Therese—as the poet put it 'die neue Thorheit auf der alten gepfropft.' Herr Marcuse nowhere even mentions Therese, although her relation to Heine was more enduring than that of Amalie, as witness the episode of her visit to Heine in Paris in 1853. It is difficult, too, to see how the theory fits in with the story of Mathilde, which is dealt with in the long chapter entitled *Henri und Mathilde*, with the sub-title, *Die Ehe zweier Kinder*, in which we are given a gushingly sentimental and on the whole unreal picture of their relationship. 'Wie war er im Tiefsten glücklich über dies derbe, redliche schlichtbürgerliche Elementarwesen', we read on p. 245. 'Im Tiefsten glücklich' is a strange way of describing the mixture of mental disturbance, jealousy, financial trouble and purely physical passion that she brought him. 'Heine hatte am meisten davon, dass er sie nicht zu einem kleinen weiblichen Bildungstierchen veredelte', we read on that same page, yet on the very next we are told that, being vain, he wanted her to do him credit, that he sent her to school, but that she was simply unteachable. There seems to be a contradiction here somewhere! 'Wer war Mathilde?', he asks when taking leave of her. 'Das grosse Liebesgedicht Heinrich Heines, an dem er fast ein Vierteljahrhundert gedichtet hat' zuerst mit allen Sinnen, zuletzt mit aller Seelenglut. Zuletzt wurde das Gedicht Mathilde die reine Hülle jener unendlichen Liebe, die immer stärker aufwuchs, je schattenhafter der Körper verging.' One might think the transition from this to 'Mouche' would prove difficult, but Herr Marcuse takes it in his stride. When we come to her story, we find among other things the following sentence: 'In zwei Dutzend Liebes-Zettelchen, die selbst so zierlich sind wie ihre Adressatin, haben wir die elfenhaften Spuren dieser platonischen Glut.' That is a bit of fine writing, but what precisely does it mean? The outstanding characteristic of the letters, apart from purely objective matters, such as accounts of his illness or arrangements for their next meeting, is their teasing, colloquial

tone, even in the expression of his love. That that love was by no means platonic, but on the contrary sensuous and passionate, is surely obvious from more than one of the letters and poems, as, for instance, the letter addressed to *Liebste Heloise*, or that of January 1, 1856, which is paraphrased in the poem *Worte! Worte! keine Taten!* It would have been superfluous to labour this aspect of the book but for the fact that this interpretation of Heine as a lover is so prominently put forward as the clue to his life and character. This 'best' life of Heine appears to my heretical mind to be on the personal side, whatever it may be on the historical, a farrago of sentimental clap-trap, imaginative and often misleading.

*Poet in Exile*, by Antonina Vallentin, is concerned with Heine's personal life, and the social and political movements of his age. It peoples Heine's world with a host of living characters. One of the best parts of the book is the account of his arrival in Paris and the galaxy of famous Frenchmen whom he met there. The story is brilliantly told, with a wealth of detail and racy anecdote. No piquant incidents are missed, and for the sensational aspects of Heine's life the authoress has made full and skilful use of the most varied sources, ranging from the fully authenticated to tales such as that of Caroline Joubert concerning Heine's purchase of Mathilde from her aunt, which can be read in books like Walter Victor's *Mathilde*. It is a well-balanced and impartial account, objectively presented, without any attempt to bend the facts to a novel formula. Heine is not made a hero, his weakness is portrayed as frankly as his strength. His illness, on the nature of which so much has been written, and concerning which modern scientific opinion is by no means unanimous, is categorically ascribed to his sexual excesses when a student at Gottingen. All the warring elements in his strange enigmatic character are analysed, his real goodness of heart and his strange insensitiveness to the feelings of others, which led him, after wounding and antagonising his best friends, to be genuinely surprised at their resentment. His reckless generosity is shown along with the undignified manoeuvres to which he was prepared to resort when in financial stress. 'To Rothschild he wrote letters which varied between the grossest flattery and the tone of the professional beggar. To follow Heine's zigzag path in his efforts to get money is soon to come upon inelegance and trickery.' The financial dependence on his uncle Solomon is seen as his curse. 'The truth is that he lacked the courage, not to merely accept hardship, but even to put up with a few privations.'

There is one aspect of the book which makes it of special topical interest to-day, the trend of events in the early nineteenth century, and particularly in Germany, presents a parable in which all may see a lesson for the times in which we live. This is never stressed or underlined, but he who runs may read. In the story of Jahn and his movement he will need only to change the names, and most of the rest will apply. 'Uneducated but impassioned, he unearthed from this past (the glorious German past) the long-dead bones of Teutonism, and established a place for himself in history by his doctrine of *Volkstum*—a word as untranslatable as the con-



ception itself is incomprehensible, but which nevertheless is destined to reappear whenever the German nation is shaken by one of the periodic paroxysms of nationalism. Jahn possessed that form of oratorical genius which seems to transform the dullest platitudes uttered into a vision inspired from on high his words and clichés, tirelessly repeated, sank into the minds of the masses as surely as a nail is driven into wood by the repeated blows of a hammer.

We shall look in vain in the book for any real account of Heine the poet. There is some brief characterisation of *Atta Troll* and *Deutschland*, and a few pages on *Romanzero*, but that is not where the interest lies. There are one or two strange slips. The remark about the famous plums is put into the mouth of Goethe, not Heine, which spoils the whole point of the story, while for anyone who knows the short and modest Bolkerstrasse (not Bolkerstrasse!) it is weird to think of its having a No. 602, which is given here as Heine's birthplace. The translation by Harrison Brown is with a few exceptions ('infelicitous affection' on p. 49 strikes one as itself not very felicitous) very well done, which is the more important since the German original is not available.

In the *Heinrich Heine* of the well-known novelist Max Brod, the author of *Heidentum*, *Christentum*, *Judentum*, we find again no attempt to reduce the Heine problem to any simple formula. Brod on the contrary stresses the complexity of character which laid Heine so often open to the charge of inconsistency. He develops with great subtlety the thesis that Heine's very political changes of front, in reaction against the excesses and extremes of the one political school or the other—which brought him, moreover, none of the advantages which a rigid and consistent championship would have conferred—are but the proof of his fundamental integrity of character. This Heine is the most heroic that I have met. 'Auch ich halte Heine für einen Helden', he says. The unpleasant incidents in his life are either ignored, or, like the legacy affair, passed lightly over with a few indifferent words, or at the most, as in the matter of the French pension, admitted to be a *Schönhertsfehler*. That does not prevent it from being a very interesting book, a bright, fresh, entirely individual and independent presentation of Heine's life and character. It is no book for the uninitiated, for very much is taken for granted. The novelist's sense of artistry does not permit him to give any bibliographical lumber, not even in most cases the dates of the works to which he refers, though he is well versed in the best Heine literature all the same. It is especially valuable because the author is in a position to envisage the Jewish problem from within, to see Heine in the light of and illuminated from the angle of modern conditions and his own experience. Thus he furnishes a very interesting parallel to the fervour for cosmopolitan culture and lack of racial prepossessions of the famous Jewish women of Berlin about the year 1800 in his own experiences with the Jewish girl refugees in the classes he held in Prague during the War. The relation of the Jews to the *Wirtsvölker* in that age of transition is fully elaborated, the problems of assimilation and racial integrity are well brought out. For Brod Heine is preeminently the man of courage, a champion of the true Jewish spirit in

the face of a facile cosmopolitanism. It is not as a great political thinker that he is presented—'als schlechter Politiker, der er in echt-jüdischer Art war' that cannot be expected here—but as a great outstanding representative of his race in the European setting of his day. In an interesting attempt to account for Heine's popularity (he has just before dealt with his unpopularity in a very unconventional way) he puts forward the striking theory that it is in part due to the fact that the Jew in his diaspora (a favourite word of the author's) stands as a symbol of Man in general in this fleeting and transient life—that every man is a *Diasporajude*, and the Jew is Everyman.

Not much space is devoted to Heine's works themselves. *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland* and *Die romantische Schule*, for instance, get only a very brief mention. The *Harzreise* is described as overrated, a routine work, which has prejudiced the understanding for his later and greater prose. The *Nordseebilder* are not his best poetry of the sea, and less individual than anything he has written—which is in direct contradiction to the recorded expression of Heine's own opinion. The only poems which receive any detailed treatment, unfortunately, are those of the *Buch der Lieder*, and though Heine's best poems are 'das eigentliche Wunder seines Lebens, das Unerklärliche, sein tiefstes Geheimnis, das er, wie jeder wahre Künstler, mit ins Grab genommen hat', there are some very illuminating personal appreciations. It is a challenging book, in which everyone will find something to disagree with, and some no doubt things which they will violently dislike. To me it seems the most original and arresting of all the works here under review.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

*Wikingsche und spielmannische Elemente im zweiten Teile des Gudrunhedes.* Von INGEBORG SCHROBLER (*Rheinische Beiträge und Hilfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie und Volkskunde*, 20.) Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1934 xxiv + 111 pp. 4 M. 80.

Disregarding the fabulous adventures of Hagen which introduce the M.H.G. epic *Kudrun* we are dealing with two separate stories that have been genealogically connected, one concerning Hilde (Part I), the other concerning her daughter Kudrun (Part II). Hermann Schneider, summing up his discussion of Part I, states: '...über die wichtigsten Fragen herrscht leidliche Einhelligkeit.'<sup>1</sup> As for Part II, he denies that there is anything 'old' in it and derives it from a presumably Low-German narrative song of the early thirteenth century. It was unlikely that scholars would remain content with these rather sweeping conclusions, and Theodor Frings,<sup>2</sup> in a re-examination of Part I, arrived at some results differing sharply from those to be found in Schneider. It had always been assumed that in its essentials the story told in Part I was one of great antiquity going back to a Baltic tradition current during early migration days. Frings argues that Hazena and Heoden in Widsith 21 have nothing to do with the Wada of the following line. Although the three names

<sup>1</sup> *Germanische Heldensage*, I, 1928, p. 371.

<sup>2</sup> 'Hilde', *Beitr.*, LIV, pp. 391 ff.

occur together in heroic song later on, it is pure chance that they are mentioned together here. Nor will Frings assent to the view that Hilde was originally connected with Hagena and Heoden. The story of the elopement of Hilde was combined with the old antagonistic pair not earlier than the ninth century by Danish Vikings. Thus the *Lay of Hilde* which seemed tolerably well established would disappear from the catalogue of early Germanic heroic lays. But before such a view can be accepted Heorrenda, the Heodeninza scop of *Deor*, has to be got out of the way. So *Deor* must either be a very late composition (here Frings is following L. Schucking) or knowledge of Heorrenda reached the English independently of any Hilde story. This is the weakest link in the argument. A singer is not likely to enter heroic song merely because he can sing, and since we know that he is connected with a story about fighting, why divorce him from it? The rest of Frings' interpretation is more orthodox. The postulated Danish Viking song reached the Netherlands and Frisia from where it travelled up the Rhine together with a Gudrun song. There was a Rhenish epic in the twelfth century, known to the author of the *Alexanderlied*, which treated the Hilde and the Gudrun story. From this the later epic was derived. Except for the introduction of an earlier Gudrun this is the usual view.

The present work, written by a member of Frings' seminar, accepts his conclusions and then attempts to sketch the development of Part II, the Gudrun story proper. The method used is the one which led to such fruitful results when it was employed by Andreas Heusler to unravel the literary history of the *Nibelungenlied*. But whereas Heusler was able to utilise chroniclers' references to migration times, Eddic sources, *Þiðrks-saga*, *Nibelungenlied*, and a host of minor sources and references, we are dependent, for Part II of Gudrun, on the corrupt and late text alone which is transmitted in the sixteenth-century *Ambraser Heldenbuch*. Miss Schrobler seems to be well aware of these difficulties, and she does not claim that her reconstruction is necessarily correct in all its details, though she does claim that Part II is 'old' and goes back, at the latest, to the eleventh century.

In establishing this early source, military, historical and geographical details are investigated. Essential features of Viking warfare are: Sudden arrival, Utilisation of topographical features, Spying and news-service, Interest in booty. It is shown that these characteristic methods of Viking warfare do not occur in Part I; some of them are found in other M.H.G. works but all of them occur only in Part II (pp. 1-16). A laborious comparison between the description of pitched battles in *Gudrun* and other M.H.G. epics (pp. 17-39) leads to no clear result.

The chapter on historical reminiscences deals mainly with Siegfried von Morland, who is identified with the historical Siegfried, the Viking leader who was besieged by the Frankish king Charles III in Elsloo in 882 and who took part in the famous siege of Paris 885-6. Fr. Panzer has already investigated the possible connexion between the two Siegfrieds in a most thorough manner<sup>1</sup> and Miss Schrobler finds nothing new to add

<sup>1</sup> *Hilde-Gudrun*, 1901, pp. 346 ff.

except an account from the *Historia Comutum Ghisnensium*, ch. 7 ff., which deals with a certain Sifridus but tells us nothing that we could connect easily with Siegfried von Morland in Part II. This is realised and the author limits herself to concluding 'dass in Flandern eine Überlieferung über einen berühmten danischen Wikinger namens Siegfried existierte' (p. 41). On p. 103, more incautiously, 'ein alteres Zeitgedicht über Siegfried von Elsloo' is postulated.<sup>1</sup>

Geographical hints in Part II are extremely vague except for Wulpensand and possibly Gusträte (*Kudrun*, verse 1164). Originally, however, Wulpensand quite certainly belonged to Part I. There remains Gusträte. Meissner (*ZfdA*. LX, pp. 129 ff.) identified this with Start Point in Devon (Low German *Golstert*, Dutch *Goustert*, *Gouster*). Frings (*Z.f.d.A.* LXI, 195 f.) added that a poet from the seaboard must have interpreted this as 'gold-street' and placed it into the picture of the sunset where it occurs. Miss Schrobler accepts the identification and Frings' further interpretation but has nothing further to add. An attempt to localise other place-names in Part II is entirely unconvincing.<sup>2</sup>

Having established that martial episodes of a certain pattern, the historical Siegfried and certain place-names all point to a Flanders-Frisian Viking source of the eleventh century at the latest, Miss Schrobler turns to the main theme of Part II, the abduction of a woman. She points to reports in Merovingian chronicles which G. Baesecke<sup>3</sup> had regarded as 'germanische Brautwerbungsdichtung',... 'die den ältesten schriftlichen Denkmälern germanischer Literatur vermutlich um Jahrhunderte vorausliegt' though Heusler<sup>4</sup> cannot conceive of such material as Germanic alliterative poetry. For Heusler they are at most poems in popular Latin by *voculatores*. He agrees, however, that there must be a tradition leading from such productions to the M.H.G. 'Spielmannsepen'.

Miss Schrobler analyses the earliest 'Brautwerbungsgeschichten' in great detail (pp. 55 ff.), shows that most traits can already be found in earliest times and arrives at the careful conclusion that this type of story is spread far and wide. This type is incorporated in the Solomon epic which introduces the recapture of the woman, and from the Solomon epic this further development was extended to other M.H.G. works. Thus it also found its way into Part II. Elements in the telling of the story which point to influence by classical M.H.G. epic are next enumerated and con-

<sup>1</sup> Heusler gives partial support to the theory of historical origin when he writes ('Geschichtliches und Mythisches in der germanischen Heldensage', *Sitzungsberichte d. preuss. Akad.*, Berlin, 1909, p. 932): 'Nicht recht glaublich ist, dass man eine Nebenfigur wie Siegfried von Morland erst aus einer Chronik geholt hatte'. Schneider remained entirely unconvinced (*Germanische Heldensage*, I, p. 374) 'Die Übereinstimmungen von Geschichte und "Sage" sind von jener vagen Art, die durch Bédiers Kritik ein für allemal den Kredit eingebusst haben sollte, es fehlt jeder konkrete Zug ausser dem so nichtssagenden Namen Sigfrid'. Unless Miss Schrobler can produce some better evidence the identification cannot be accepted.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that there are no English forms containing a first element. Earliest form: *La Sterte*, anno 1310. Cf. *English Place-Name Society*, VIII, *The Place-Names of Devon*, p. 332. Meissner and Miss Schrobler always call the Devon head-land 'Point-of-Start'. I cannot find any evidence for this form.

<sup>3</sup> *Der Münchener Oswald*, 1907, p. 303.

<sup>4</sup> Hoops, *Reallexikon d. germ. Altertumskunde*, I, p. 376, s.v. 'Chlodwig'.

trasted with the cruder ideas and different technique of the portions that betray the hand of the older 'Spielmann'.

The following conclusions are reached (a) Poem of the eleventh century at the latest, written at the time of the last Viking raids on the Netherlands, which tells the story of Gudrun with tragic end and introduces the methods of Viking warfare. This poem must have been a mixture of 'Heldendichtung und Zeitdichtung'. Miss Schrobler also suggests that these Viking details were superimposed on an older song of Gudrun. For the older song of Gudrun there is not a tittle of evidence, and the poem of the eleventh century must have been of considerable length if it dealt with the technical aspects of Viking raids in such a lucid manner that these details were preserved for hundreds of years. A poem of such length is, however, a little unconvincing for the Flanders of the eleventh century. (b) 'Spielmannsepos' of the twelfth century, of Rhenish origin. This was either independent or was joined already at this stage to Part I, the Hilde-story. (c) The epic as we know it from the *Ambraser Heldenbuch*.

The work has been carefully done. Strict proof is impossible from the nature of the evidence. We shall probably have to accept, against Schneider, Part II either as an independent 'Spielmannsepos' or as part of a 'Spielmannsepos' of the twelfth century; the poem of the eleventh century, however, remains nebulous and unconvincing.

There is an excellent bibliography of sources and critical discussions on pp. xiii-xx

F. NORMAN.

LONDON.

*Practische Uitspraakleer van de Nederlandsche Taal.* By E. BLANCQUAERT. Antwerp. 'De Sikkel.' 1934. 276 pp.

It is well known that the southern Netherlands (Flanders and Brabant) were the centres of Dutch culture in the Middle Ages, and that the dialects in which by far the greater number of literary works was written were the southern ones, since even those authors who lived in other provinces of the Netherlands tried to conform to the literary language of Flanders and Brabant. No standard *spoken* language developed, however, until the seventeenth century, and by then the province of Holland had become the cultural centre of the new Republic, which was formed by the seven northern provinces. The south became first a Spanish, then an Austrian possession, and lost much of its economic and cultural importance. No standard speech ever developed there; the people and the middle classes continued to speak their dialects, and French, which was spoken at the Court of Brussels, gradually became the language of the educated class. At the time when the kingdom of Belgium was established this process was well-nigh completed.

The Flemish movement, which from 1840 onwards steadily gained ground in Belgium, needed a standard language that could supplant French as the language of culture, and thus put an end to the unnatural cleavage between the higher classes and the rest of the nation. There were two centres whose dialects had achieved a certain ascendancy over

the others Antwerp, because it was the most important Flemish city (Brussels was and is largely gallicised), and West Flanders, where the example of the poet Guido Gezelle led to the use of a purified West Flemish for literary purposes. Neither dialect, however, was influential enough ever to become accepted by the whole Dutch-speaking part of Belgium; an established standard speech was required for this. Hence the leaders of the movement began to advocate the adoption of the standard language of Holland. The opposition with which their propaganda was at first received gradually died down, and we may say that the wisdom of their suggestion is now no longer questioned. The number of those who are actually able to use standard Dutch as their natural speech, however, is still small, and it is with a view to improving this state of affairs that the *Practische Uitspraakleer van de Nederlandsche Taal* has been written. The author, Dr E. Blancquaert, is professor of Dutch Philology and Head of the Phonetic Laboratory and of the Institute of Dialectology in the University of Ghent, so that he was eminently qualified for the task he set himself.

The book is meant to be used by school teachers and students as a help towards acquiring a good pronunciation and that knowledge of phonetics which is necessary in order to teach the standard speech to dialect speakers. Professor Blancquaert originally meant to have written a more exhaustive text-book of phonetics and a Pronouncing Dictionary of the Dutch language, but he felt that the present work, as it was of greater social importance, had to come first.

It is therefore primarily a text-book of the pronunciation of standard Dutch for the southern school teacher, and as such it will serve its purpose admirably. For the author has an intimate knowledge of nearly all the Dutch dialects spoken in Belgium, and he has the gift of expressing the most difficult questions of phonetics in simple language. Its scientific accuracy, however, is not at all impaired by this. Hence the book will at the same time prove to be a fuller account of the phonetic structure of standard Dutch than is given in any of the existing works on the subject. For H. Zwaardemaker and L. P. H. Eykman's *Leerboek der Phonetiek* (Haarlem, 1928) is mainly a handbook of general phonetics with some chapters on the phonetics of Dutch, Kruisinga's *Grammar of Modern Dutch* has a valuable chapter on the sounds of Dutch, but this could naturally be only an abstract (25 pages). As for Lecoutere and Grootaers' *Inleiding tot de Taalkunde*, Quick and Schilthuis' *A Dutch Phonetic Reader* (London, 1930) and P. Roorda's *De Klankleer en hare praktische Toepassingen* (Groningen, 1919), these are works for beginners which do not pretend to be exhaustive. So we may say that Blancquaert's book supplies a real need here.

In the third place the student of dialect will find many valuable observations in it on the phonetic peculiarities of the Dutch dialects spoken in Belgium, from the west of Flanders to the extreme east of Limburg. For in order to enable the teacher to cure dialectal ways of pronunciation Professor Blancquaert has given phonetic descriptions of the vowels and consonants of a number of dialects. It would be an easy matter for a

student of dialect to collect together the information thus scattered throughout the book to obtain a fairly representative picture of the phonetic structure of these dialects

The book abounds in illuminating remarks on the characteristic qualities of Dutch pronunciation, stressing and intonation,<sup>1</sup> and on the differences between northern and southern Dutch generally. I mention among many others the explanation of the phonetic difference between *v* and *w*, the description of [ʃ], [ʒ] and [s], which in Dutch are formed with a slight rounding of the lips, and the definition of the syllable.

It is to be hoped that the author will carry out his plan of publishing the more exhaustive text-book of phonetics which he has promised us in his preface, and that the intimate knowledge of the southern Dutch dialects, of which his work bears ample testimony, will find fuller expression than was possible within this compass. This should not prevent us, however, from being grateful for the important contribution to the phonetics of both standard Dutch and the southern dialects which is made by the present work.

T. WEEVERS.

LONDON.

*The First Part of Goethe's Faust* Translated by JOHN SHAWCROSS  
London The Scholartis Press. 1934. 7s. 6d. net

J. WOLFGANG VON GOETHE, *Faust, Parts One and Two* Translated by  
GEORGE MADISON PRIEST New York Covici, Friede. 1932. \$5.00

*Goethe's Faust* (Part II). An Acting Version by GRAHAM and TRISTAN  
RAWSON. London: The Bodley Head. 1933. 2s. 6d. net

*The Practical Wisdom of Goethe*. An Anthology chosen by EMIL LUDWIG,  
translated by F. MELIAN STAWELL and NORA PURTSCHER-WYDEN-  
BRUCK. London George Allen and Unwin. 1933. 6s.

The question which was so often asked during the year 1932: What does Goethe mean to the cultured Anglo-Saxon? has received its answer in the above list of translations. It is *Faust*, and again *Faust*, and an anthology! Is this really all that remains for us of the 150 volumes of the collected works? And it is with some sadness that one contrasts the enthusiasm for German spiritual values which ruled in England one hundred years ago with the indifference and quasi-hostility of the present generation.

It is some comfort, however, to know that *Faust*, at least, still has its appeal to the English, for there is no poem in any literature which so epitomises the achievements of a man and his country as does this supreme synthesis of the German mind with its depth, its wisdom, its spontaneity and sincerity, its idealism, its sentiment, its inwardness, and its awareness of the infinite. No English scholar could have received better training in these aspects of a great literature than the Senior Lecturer in English in

<sup>1</sup> Here the author was able to draw on the material collected in two monographs on the subject. L. J. Guttart's *De Intonatie van het Nederlands, met inbegrip van een Vergelyking met de Engelse Intonatie* (Utrecht, 1925), and Dr E. S. W. Pée's 'Beitrag zum Studium der Niederländischen Intonation' (Archives Néerlandaises de Phonétique Expérimentale, VII (1932), VIII (1933)).

the University of Liverpool, whose intensive study of Coleridge has fitted him, like none other, to deal with poetry at metaphysical depth. It was only to be expected that Mr Shawcross would reproduce Goethe's poetry with sympathy and appreciation in a version which flows naturally and effortlessly into idiomatic and poetic English, presenting not only the spirit but the very rhythm of the original German

Torrent and stream from the ice's weight  
Are freed by the quickening breath of spring:  
With joy of new life the green valleys sing,  
And winter, sullen and desolate,  
Back to his mountains is hastening.

A much more ambitious, and correspondingly more difficult, task was set himself by Professor Priest when he undertook to lay the whole of *Faust* in its literary and historic setting before an English-speaking public. He is obviously well acquainted with 'the literature of the subject', and his select Bibliography affords excellent advice to the serious reader. But he spends rather too much space in the mere analysis of the poem's contents, and too little on its interpretation and appreciation, and often relegates to the notes information that would have been better marshalled in its right place in the Introduction. Not but that both introduction and notes are useful and readable enough, though they may contain nothing new for a student with the editions of Witkowski or Petsch before him. The work stands or falls, however, by the quality of the translation, and here Professor Priest has been successful. His procedure was wisely eclectic, and he has made good and full use of his predecessors where they seemed to him admirable. In particular he has utilised the translation, printed and in MS, of W. P. Andrews. In the second Part the well-known renderings of Bayard Taylor and Anna Swanwick were laid under contribution, as Mr B. Q. Morgan has shown in some detail in his review in the *Journal of English and German Philology* (xxxii, p. 429). It is obvious that such a procedure must inevitably entail the loss of stylistic and artistic uniformity, but in the scholarly hands of Mr Priest it makes up in accuracy for what it loses in presentation.

The names of Graham and Tristan Rawson are already familiar to English play-goers as the authors of a successful rendering of *Faust* presented at the Old Vic in 1924. They have now followed up this success with a translation of the second Part, or rather with such portions of the second Part as seemed to lend themselves to dramatic presentation. They were thus guided by purely practical considerations of the theatre and this necessitated the substitution of blank verse for Goethe's more complicated metres. The result, as visitors to the Festival Theatre at Cambridge will agree, is a most effective stage play. The pruning has been severe—act III, sc 1 has been reduced from 633 lines to less than a third of that number—but Mr Rawson is a practised dramatic craftsman, and if the play was to appear at all on a modern stage such treatment was inevitable, even though the poetry should suffer in the process.

*The Practical Wisdom of Goethe* is equally the work of an adept in popularising the work of the world's great men. This volume affords a



much-needed corrective for the English reader who has derived his knowledge of Goethe the Man from Herr Ludwig's one-sided presentation in his biography. For Goethe, the Philosopher, was very different from the dæmonic, erotic, romantic personality which Emil Ludwig had previously presented to the world. We have here rather the serene humanist for whom the art of life consists in wise renunciation, yet in the conviction that within these limitations life is good, and well worth living, if only man will put forth the best effort of which he is capable. There is much in these cleverly chosen sayings that is of application to our own distracted age: words of comfort and faith, an avowal of the increase in personality that comes of renunciation and suffering, the conviction that only in living and learning can man attain wisdom, an insight into politics and power, wars and revolutions which is almost prophetic of our present-day problems. 'On the need for conserving tradition and warding off revolution I agree with the monarchists, but not with their choice of means. They summon stupidity and darkness to their help. I call for intelligence and light.' So Goethe wrote in 1823 and the statesmen of Europe in 1935 might do worse than follow his advice.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY

LONDON.

*Publications of the English Goethe Society, New Series, vol. x. Papers read before the Society, 1934.* Edited by L. A. WILLOUGHBY. Cambridge University Press 1934. 100 pp. 10s. 6d.

Volume x of the new series of the publications of the *English Goethe Society* fully maintains the high standard of previous volumes. Of the five papers which it comprises, four are concerned chiefly or largely with Goethe himself, in one or another aspect of his genius and affinities. Miss Butler in a penetrating study (*Goethe and Winckelmann*) discusses the influence of Winckelmann's vision of the great age of Greece upon Goethe's spiritual development, especially in its contribution to the unceasing struggle in his soul between the dæmonic and anti-dæmonic forces, the impulse 'to destroy and be destroyed', and the restraining power which made for harmony and stability. This struggle, in which neither of the contending forces was wholly triumphant, Miss Butler follows in its various manifestations in Goethe's life and writings up to the final resolution (if resolution it was) in *Faust*, Pt. II. She makes out a strong case for her view that the influence of Winckelmann's golden age on Goethe was a sinister one, deflecting as it did 'the great Northern genius from his true and predestined bent'. In contrast to this view, we have Nietzsche's impression of Goethe as presented (but not endorsed) by Mr A. H. J. Knight in his paper on *Nietzsche and Goethe*. We here see that in Nietzsche's view Goethe's was not a tragic nature, but one which tended essentially to contemplation and harmonious self-development. For Nietzsche the so-called 'classical Goethe' is the real Goethe: even in *Faust* he sees not a tragic, dæmonic figure, but the 'prototype of the theoretic man', with whose nature therefore Nietzsche himself, especially in his later years, cannot fully sympathise. Another aspect of Goethe's genius is presented

by Professor Barker Farley in his paper on *Wordsworth and Goethe*, a comparative study of the two poets in respect of their vision of nature and natural appearances. The essence of the parallel is that whereas Wordsworth's vision is blended of 'nature seen and nature recollected'—past memories mingling with and disturbing the present intuition—Goethe allows nothing to interfere with the singleness and directness of the immediate experience. This means for either poet a gain and a loss, but the greater gain is Goethe's. Wordsworth is given 'a great reservoir of strength from which Goethe is cut off'. on the other hand, by sternly rejecting memory, Goethe achieves a vision and philosophy of nature far more direct, consistent and penetrating than is possible to Wordsworth. In *Jean Paul and Goethe* Herr Karl-Werner Maurer gives us a characterisation of Jean-Paul's genius and temperament in its strength and weakness, with especial reference to the influence of Goethe's personality and example upon his writings. Herr Maurer draws the conclusion that this influence was on the whole harmful, since it led the younger writer to strive after the classical objectivity and harmony of form which he admired in his great contemporary, but which, owing to inherent limitations, he was himself incapable of attaining.

Finally, in *Coleridge and his Contemporaries* Professor Willoughby draws upon his stores of knowledge to give us a lively picture of Coleridge in his personal contacts with many eminent German writers and critics of his day (in the number of whom, sad to relate, neither Goethe nor Schiller was included). We see Coleridge's attitude to these men and their writings as friendly and appreciative indeed, but none the less critical and independent—a relationship of affinity far more than of indebtedness. For, as Professor Willoughby reminds us, Coleridge 'early considered himself a leader of men', one whose apprehension of great principles was intuitive and not derived.

J. SHAWCROSS.

LIVERPOOL.

## SHORT NOTICES

In *The Year's Work in English Studies* (Vol. XIII, 1932. Oxford: University Press. 1934. 348 pp. 10s. 6d.) the English Association, for whom the volume is edited by Dr F. S. Boas and Dr Mary Serjeantson, provides an invaluable guide to labours in the field of English during the year under review in this, the thirteenth volume of the series. The editors continue to be fortunate in their collaborators, and competent critics discuss, with specialised authority, the work done in each part of the great field. It is an immense task to cover the activities of such a body of workers throughout the world, and this can only be done with the co-operation of scholars outside of England. Altogether, there could be no better proof of the skill and generosity of English scholarship than this work provides, or better evidence of the enlightened policy of the English Association.

Among the major contributions to learning during the year 1932 we may single out Professor Wyld's *Universal Dictionary of the English Language*, Professor Carleton Brown's *English Lyrics of the Thirteenth Century*, Professor R. W. Chambers' essay *On the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More*, the first volume of the *Variorum Spenser*, edited by Professors Greenlaw, Osgood and Padelford, two more volumes of Professor Hebel's *Drayton*, one of Herford and Simpson's *Ben Jonson*, the completion of the first six volumes of the *Columbia Milton*, and two further volumes of the *Boswell Papers*. It has been a notable 'editors' year', and it is grievous to think that we shall have no further gifts from the pens of such scholars as Herford, Greenlaw and Hebel. The year was also notable for bibliographical books, with two important works to show, McKerrow and Ferguson's *Title-page Borders, 1485-1640*, and Frank Isaac's *English and Scottish Printing Types, 1535-58*. Incidentally, there is no more useful chapter in *The Year's Work*, among so much that is excellent, than Mr Sellers' *Bibliographica*. C. J. S.

Professor Emile Legouis' illustrated *Short History of English Literature* (Oxford Clarendon Press. 1934. 404 pp. 6s.) is not only a survey of our literature from *Beowulf* to the present day, embodying the ripe reading and experience of an elder statesman among scholars. It is also an interesting reflection of the varying valuations which are in some part due to the nationality of the scholar, traceable perhaps in the treatment of Donne and in the striking omission of any mention of Chapman as an original poet. Yet Professor Legouis appreciates, as not all do, the quality of Layamon. The need for brevity explains perhaps the want of qualification in the statement that Chaucer 'is too talkative, he cannot condense' (p. 43). The vogue of Kipling in France is reflected here, in Professor Legouis' faith in the certainty of his survival, and in his recognition in Kipling of the age-long, unchanging ideals of Anglo-Saxondom. Here, as elsewhere, we feel the loyalty of Professor Legouis to the people whose literature has engaged the devotion of a life-time and, through the scholar and teacher, has inspired successive generations of students in France. C. J. S.

It is impossible to let pass the separate publication of Saintsbury's *Cambridge History* chapters on Shakespeare (*Shakespeare* Cambridge University Press. 1934. 131 pp. 3s. 6d.) without some salutation of a great critic, probably the most considerable figure in the world of criticism during his day. Miss Helen Waddell's appreciation prefixed to this reprint expresses something of the deep loyalty which Saintsbury inspired among his disciples, with good cause. Never man loved literature, and above all poetry, more devotedly, or more independently. And the man who found Donne for us had much of the poet in himself. He was infinitely more than a mere vast reader. He re-lived innumerable works of art, and knew how to communicate his own zest in the experience. The man is to be found in his writings, none of which can be neglected.

But it will be a sad loss to posterity if Saintsbury's last wishes are respected and no biography is written, no letters published.

C. J. S

Mr Hugh C. H. Candy's pamphlet, *Milton the Individualist in Metre* (London. Nisbet. 24 pp. 1s.), is reprinted with alterations and additions from *Notes and Queries*, September 6th and 13th, 1930, and is supplementary to his *Some Newly Discovered Stanzas written by John Milton on Engraved Scenes illustrating Ovid's Metamorphoses*, published in 1924. In the latter volume he noted incidentally the metrical resemblances between Milton's poems and these stanzas, now he pursues the quest systematically, using Bridges' *Prosody* as a guide. For identifying Milton's hand the metrical argument is peculiarly cogent, and Mr Candy has done well to present this part of his case separately. He finds good parallels (not infrequently with close verbal resemblances) for (i) both weak and inverted stresses in each of the five possible positions, (ii) two and three inverted stresses in one line, (iii) lines with more than five stresses, (iv) the caesura in all nine possible positions, and two or three caesuras in the same line, (v) nine, eleven and twelve syllables to the line, with Milton's characteristic use of the trisyllable. This covers a good deal of the required ground, and the accumulated evidence is certainly impressive.

B. A. W

The biographical study of *Amelia Alderson Opie Worldling and Friend*, by the late Margaret Eliot Macgregor (*Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, xiv, 1-2 Northampton, Mass. Smith College. 1932-3. xv+146 pp. \$1.50), is an excellent piece of work. Miss Macgregor has had access to manuscript and little-known sources, letters and memoirs of Mrs Opie herself and of her numerous friends, and has read them with sympathy and insight; her study is well-balanced and readable, and does full justice to Mrs Opie's attractive and many-sided personality. Of her novels and other works Miss Macgregor had intended to include a detailed criticism, but the short comments included in the biography give what is essential. In that as well as in other ways Miss Macgregor's friends have carried through the editorial work with care and judgment, and the reproductions of Opie's portraits of his wife and Mary Wollstonecraft give an added attraction to the volume.

H. W. H.

Miss Sylva Norman's edition of Hogg's letters to Jane Williams (*After Shelley The Letters of Thomas Jefferson Hogg to Jane Williams*. London. Oxford University Press. 1934. xlv+94 pp. 7s 6d) contains a letter from Mr T. J. Wise's collection addressed by Hogg to Shelley in 1820 and a series of letters, the originals of which are in the British Museum, from Hogg to Jane Williams. In a graceful introduction Miss Norman gives a valuable biographical account of the two last-mentioned and attempts to explain why they attracted each other. It is evident that even in old age Jane Williams possessed something of the charm which had fascinated Shelley, but, in spite of some pleasing traits in his hard, egoistic character, such as his sensitiveness to natural beauty, Hogg,

remains a strange creature, with whom it is impossible to feel great sympathy. For the light that the letters throw on the characters of these friends of Shelley the reader will be grateful.

The editor might have noted that when Hogg wrote that he had been to Dinas Mwddw (p. 76), he meant Dinas Mawddwy. H. G. W.

Miss Louise Snitslaar, in her *Sidelights on Robert Browning's 'The Ring and the Book'* (Amsterdam: 'Pronto'. 1934. 147 pp.), has concentrated on the minor characters. She sets out 'to write a vindication of these minor characters', but she spends little time on this question and seems to confuse aesthetic with other issues. It is not a justification of the lawyers' speeches to say that 'though faulty, they form a strong connecting link with the Old Yellow Book'. The pleasure Browning aimed at giving his readers was not that of comparing his poem with its source. Miss Snitslaar regards the lawyers' speeches as parodies and she gives summaries of the lawyers' pamphlets from the source, to show how Browning burlesqued their arguments. These summaries do not show clearly the line of argument; often they only give the points treated. When she turns to the poem, Miss Snitslaar does not seem to realise that Arcangel's speech is a speech in process of composition, whereas Bottini's is the finished product. At one point, too, she makes nonsense of Bottini's argument, by taking as his own opinion words he is putting into his opponent's mouth. Since the Old Yellow Book is easily accessible and since Professor Cook has annotated the poem exhaustively, it is difficult to see what purpose a study of this kind serves. Professor Cook has already defended the five monologues treated here and Miss Snitslaar follows his line of defence. H. L. G.

A selection from Montaigne, for those who have either not the time nor the proficiency to study him intact, must prove a valuable introduction to the historical and social variations in modern French and to the part French works have played in modern thought. To students of ordinary and advanced 'Pass' standards Messrs A. Tilley and A. M. Boase have therefore rendered an important service in their *Montaigne: Selected Essays* (Manchester University Press. 1934. xxix + 252 pp. 4s. 6d.). Their text is that of M. Strowski's edition, distinguishing the readings of 1580 (A), 1588 (B) and the Bordeaux copy (C). The choice of essays, the introduction and individual headnotes fit together admirably to give the reader an accurate general idea of Montaigne's manner, interests, style and development. In the literary sense it is a Montaignian *multum in parvo*. For the linguistic aspect the editors have not shown the same care. Neither the glossary nor the translations at the foot of the text (welcome though these are) suffice to enlighten the student as to the special characteristics of sixteenth-century French or of Montaigne's lexicon. The sharp distinction between language and literature normal in our teaching is indefensible, for literary appreciation also requires a complete appreciation of the language. A brief compendium, like that of Professor von Wartburg for Rabelais in *Évolution et structure de la Langue Française*,

would have served to orientate the pupil in this important matter. Montaigne's quotations are translated and identified, but his other references have been unevenly handled, yet they are often of more importance for the thought than the passages expressly cited. In *A* Montaigne expresses a certain indifference to Greek literature, but the additional matter in *C* has a markedly Hellenic character. Especially important is the relation between the *Essais* (*C* text) and the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The editors have run down one citation, in 'De l'expérience', but there are many others, and most notably those in 'De l'affection des pères aux enfans', where Montaigne makes a précis of an Aristotelian chapter. There is a certain similarity in method between Montaigne and the *Nicomachean Ethics* which conquers his aversion for 'ces ordonnances logiciennes et Aristoteliques', and, as the Greek was the more resolute thinker, Montaigne uses him to give a fine point to his own observations. Such an author deserves to have all his references identified, as they will have to be by anyone lecturing on this book. On p. 40 (note p. 231) the fourth of the 'quatre victoires sœurs' was surely not Syracuse (415) but Himera (480) which, like Salamis and the others, freed Greek lands from barbarism. P. 163: 'Francisco' is the Spanish form, not 'Francesco'. P. 170 the accents on the Greek quotation should be set right. P. 194 (note p. 244). the editors have hardly taken Montaigne's point. The *Euthydemus* and *Protagoras* are not cited for their logic-chopping, but as dialogues in which Socrates examines the assertions of experts and upsets them without advancing views of his own. This was the real Socratic manner according to Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, but it only appears in some Platonic dialogues, and therefore Montaigne quite appropriately uses the former to limit Plato, when he says 'en Platon et en Xenophon'.

W. J. E.

Miss D. McGhee's *Voltairean Narrative Devices as considered in the Author's Contes Philosophiques* (Menasha, Wisconsin. George Banta Publishing Company 1933 192 pp) describes itself as 'a consideration of the structure of the tales, and of the devices, whether structural or stylistic, which aid in evoking irony within that structure'. 'Within that structure' the author remains throughout, refusing to look outside the *Contes* themselves for anything which might throw light on the art of the *conteur*. Part I, it is true, briefly recounts the development of the *Conte Philosophique*, and makes use of an interesting document—the catalogue of Voltaire's books, discovered by Professor Havens in Leningrad—to show how the *genre* was represented in his library. But this outline, which makes no claims to originality and contains too many generalisations to be very helpful—those concerning the seventeenth century even seem rather out-of-date, especially after M. Magendie's book—appears to have no immediate bearing on the chapters that follow. Parts II and III aim at showing that 'the very structure of the plot evokes irony', chiefly through systematic contrast and antithesis (graphically represented for *Le Monde Comme Il Va*, *Zadig*, *Candide* and other tales), incongruity of setting and situation, or situation and character; management of plot

'threads' to create suspense and 'climactic effects', the manipulation of climax and conclusion. With Part IV we come to stylistic devices: iteration of certain words and phrases, overstatement, absurdity defeating absurdity, 'projection' from specific to general, etc.

Miss McGhee is well aware that all these devices have frequently been used by other writers; 'what gives them a distinctly Voltairian turn', she says, 'is that they are compressed with unbelievable force and piquancy into tales of such brevity'. But classification fails when it comes to penetrating these higher mysteries of the craft, and in the very nature of things explanation of irony is apt to fall rather flat. For all the reading and industry that have gone to the writing of this book, the author seems to have under-estimated the twin dangers which made her task formidable: the Scylla of obviousness and its Charybdis, *chercher midi à quatorze heures*. It is with a sense of discomfort that one reads, for instance "Colin admira l'habit et ne fut point jaloux, mais Jeannot prit un air de supériorité qui affligea Colin." Addition of the conjunction *et* to an already expected *mais* enforces the contrast between humility and pride which is to form the basis of the entire *conte*. Or: "Tous les ministres d'État conclurent que le taureau blanc était sorcier. C'était tout le contraire, il était ensorcelé, mais on se trompe toujours à la cour dans ces affaires délicates." Additional irony accompanies the projection in this instance—contrast between "tout le contraire" and "ces affaires délicates" [?] Such a simple matter as a totally opposite view is only the ordinary thing at court.' Or this description of the mode of evoking irony in *Macromégas*. 'As an illustration of the reflection process—the first sight of Europe (the known) through its insignificance in their eyes (i.e., in the eyes of Sirius, the unknown), reflects back upon itself (the known) its smallness.' Such passages are unfortunately not exceptional.

H. B.

Twenty-three pieces are reprinted to illustrate Spanish balladry for class-room purposes, with introduction and notes, by Herr L. Pfandl in his *Spanische Romanzen* (*Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte* Halle Niemeyer, 1933. viii + 108 pp. 4 M. 60). He remarks on the little agreement to be found among Spanish ballad critics, the disagreement extending even to the description of the material. Herr Pfandl proposes to apply a classification by epoch in the first instance (Mediæval, Renaissance, Baroque), before using the current division by subject. Undoubtedly all students make some such distinction sub-consciously or consciously, but in matters of detail one finds the Spanish Renaissance does not break with the Middle Ages, while 'baroque' is a quality or manner rather than a period, and does not perfectly apply to some Baroque ballads. Within the periods, he distinguishes variously as best suits the material to hand. The mediæval ballads he divides into four classes: Nationale Epenstoffe, Französische Epenstoffe, Grenzkriegsromanzen, Königsromanzen. These, however, omit one class that exists in Spain and is very important in Anglo-Danish balladry, viz., the pieces based on folklore or wandering wisps of tradition (some of the latter literary in origin, but living detached

from their original context). Such themes are often very far travelled—as far as Russia and Rumania—and it was not without plausibility that Andrew Lang looked to them for an explanation of ballad-origins. They link balladry with popular song. In Spain they are, however, almost always immigrants. The class of 'Königsromenzen', if it embrace both the Rodrigo and the Pedro ballads, is fortuitous rather than essential. The Rodrigo-cycle depends on the *Crónica Sarracina* (1430), which in its turn depends on an old historical and literary tradition, which may or may not have had an epic phase in Castile, its place, with this proviso, is rather in the 'Nationale Epenstoffe', as the Spanish scholars have agreed. The Pedro-cycle, as I have sought to show in this *Review* (1930), is anterior to the written documents in at least its oldest instances, and arises directly out of the passions and peripeties of the Civil Wars, that is to say, is strictly an historic cycle, like the Serbian Kosovo ballads or the Danish ones of Niels Ebbesen. It is not a question of absolute historical veracity, but of origin directly in the events sung. As such the Pedro-cycle is akin to the *fronterizo*-ballads, and in fact the two ballads of sieges of Baeza (1358 and 1407) bind together the civil and frontier wars into one corpus. Sres Menéndez Pidal and Buceta have shown that the *fronterizo*-ballads do not spring from the chronicles, as Menéndez y Pelayo appeared to hint, but from the events, and are themselves sources for the chroniclers. Herr Pfandl, in my opinion, does well to separate them from the 'Nationale Epenstoffe', contrary to the Spanish practice, as the latter depend not on the events directly, but on a literary tradition. Some of the Roncesvalles ballads are, in all probability, related to the Spanish *cantar* of Roncesvalles, in precisely the same way as Cid-ballads to the ancient poems on the Cid; the difference of nationality is not an essential difference to override community of origin. In other Carolingian cycles the ballads are not fragmentary, but seek to give an impression of a whole work, possibly a fifteenth-century chap-book, and yet others (like the Durandarte series) may be free compositions within the Carolingian convention. Thus one class of epic ballads embraces subdivisions according as the pieces are directly related to episodes of *cantares de gesta* (Spanish national, or Spanish-Carolingian), or to Carolingian romances, or vaguely to the Carolingian tradition. A second class includes the historical ballads, mostly located in Andalusia, and embracing (a) the Civil War, and (b) the frontier minstrelsy, the latter divided by the year 1481. A third class includes ballads based on folk-lore or wandering motifs, and is highly miscellaneous. These three classes are probably irreducible. One cannot explain the historical series by the epic (the latter being scanty in Anglo-Danish tradition, and absent from Eastern Europe), nor probably the epic by the historic. The third class, by its foreign provenance, is not material to Spanish ballad origins, and links up with popular lyric poetry in general. But its rise cannot be attributed to the causes that gave us the other two series, which have at most worked out and imposed a particular form on the available folk-lore matter.

W. J. E.



In a Rostock dissertation (*Herrscherdämmerung und Deutschlands Erwachen in Wagners 'Ring des Nibelungen'* by Rudolf Grisson. Leipzig. Adolf Klein-Verlag. 1934 214 pp.) the author, in conscious opposition to Shaw's one-sided interpretation of the *Ring* as an illustration of our industrial age and to Schopenhauer's pessimism, sees in Wagner's cycle the promise of a new age of liberty and love. The result is attractive, though not free of exaggeration, both in ideas and style. The Rheingold is taken to be a symbol of cursed Mammon. The giants (not workers as Shaw supposed) are burghers and peasants of the Middle Ages, and Wotan is the medieval German king. Siegmund is regarded as the liberator of 1848/49. Thus the marriage of brother and sister and the inheritance of the sword obtain a new significance. Brunhilde is the awakening of a people's love for their leader (Siegfried). Grisson points out convincing affinities between Wagner, Shelley, Proudhon, Hafiz, and also discusses the relationship between the 'Nibelungen' and the Prometheus myth, already discovered by Grimm and Petsch (*Wagner-Jahrbuch*, 1907), though Grisson regards Alberich, not Loge, as the light-bringer. The most interesting chapter of this work, however, deals with the influence of Raumer's *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen* on Wagner and the latter's consequent idealization of the figure of Friedrich Barbarossa as the last champion of an originally heroic feudal system. Barbarossa is the reincarnation of Siegfried. A. C.

In *Altislandische Namenwahl*, (*Palaestra* 176. Leipzig: Mayer and Muller. 1931. xii + 136 pp. 11 M. 20) Mr M. Keil discusses, with many illustrations, the principles which seem to have governed the choice of names for children during the Viking Age. The author is very successful in setting out his material clearly; he shows how the new name alliterated with existing names, or incorporated some element, or variation of an element, already present in the names of the rest of the kindred, thereby providing an outward symbol of the unity of the family group. In later chapters he discusses interesting cases of name giving and reviews the literature of the subject. It seems strange that he did not use Wessén's essays, 'Nordiska Namnstudier', until the end of his work, nevertheless, he discusses his conclusions in an excursus. Mention might also have been made of G. T. Flom's article in *Modern Language Notes*, xxxii (1917), pp. 7 ff. G. N. G.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS

January—March 1935

With the collaboration of Dr MARY S. SERJEANTSON (English),  
Dr A. GILLIES and Dr F. P. PICKERING (German).

### GENERAL.

- Académie des Inscriptions, Comptes rendus, table, 1901-30 Paris, Picard. 40 fr.  
Arthurian Bibliography for 1934 (typescript) Mod Lang Assn. of America  
BIANQUIS, GENEVIÈVE, Faust à travers les âges Paris, Droz 24 fr.  
BOUTCHIK, V., Bibliographie des œuvres littéraires russes traduites en français.  
Paris, Librairie Régionaliste 25 fr  
Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque publique de la ville de Bruges Paris,  
Belles Lettres 120 fr  
DAVY, M. M., Les Dominicaines Paris, Coll. Les Grands Ordres Monastiques  
15 fr  
DUMESNIL, R., Histoire de la musique, illustrée. Paris, Plon 60 fr  
EGILSRUD, J. S., Le 'Dialogue des Morts' dans les littératures française, allemande  
et anglaise, 1644-1789 Paris, Vége. 25 fr  
FARKAS, J. VON, Die Entwicklung der ungarischen Literatur. Berlin, De Gruyter  
6 M  
FUNCK-BRENTANO, F., La Renaissance. Paris, Fayard 16 fr. 50.  
(GRABMANN) Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters. Studien und Texte .  
Grabmann gewidmet. (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und  
Theologie des Mittelalters.) 58 M  
Harvard Notes and Studies in Philology and Literature, xvi Harvard and  
Oxford Univ Presses. 10s. 6d.  
HAZARD, F., La Crise de la conscience européenne, 1680-1715. 3 vols. Paris,  
Boivin. 80 fr.  
JELÍNEK, H., Histoire de la littérature tchèque de 1890 à nos jours. Paris,  
Sagittaire 25 fr.  
JOSEPHUS, La Prise de Jérusalem, texte vieux-russe publié intégralement par  
V Istrin, Fr. trsl P Pascal, i. Paris, Inst d'Études Slaves. 100 fr. (for  
two vols ).  
QUONIAM, T., Erasme (Temps et Visages) Paris, Desclée de Brouwer. 15 fr.  
RANKE, F., Volkssagenforschung, Vorträge und Aufsätze (Deutschkundliche  
Arbeiten) 4 M  
REFARAZ, G. DE, Historia de la colonización (Col Labor) 2 vols. Barcelona,  
Talleres Ibero-Americanos 10 ptas.  
SAVADJIAN, L., Bibliographie balkanique, 1934. Paris, Revue des Balkans. 40 fr  
SERVIEN, P., Principes d'Esthétique Paris, Boivin. 18 fr.  
SPARGO, J. W., Virgil the necromancer. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s.  
VOINOVITCH, L. DE, Histoire de Dalmatie 2 vols. Paris, Hachette. 60 fr  
WALPOLE, H. and Others, Tendencies of the Modern Novel London, Allen and  
Unwin 3s 6d.

### ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- BEYER, C., Die Verba des 'Essens', 'Schickens', 'Kaufens' und 'Findens' in  
ihrer Geschichte vom Latein bis in die romanischen Sprachen (Leipziger  
Romanische Studien, ix). Leipzig, Roman. Seminar 4 M.  
HENGSTLER, A., Geistliche, Monch und Nonne im Spiegel der volkstümlichen  
romanischen Namengebung. Diss. Tübingen, Gobel.  
MEYER-LUBKE, W., Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Schluss des  
Wortverzeichnisses). Heidelberg, Winter. 6 M.

## Mediaeval Latn.

- BACONI, ROGERI, Opera hactenus inedita, XII Questiones supra librum de causis; XIII Questiones supra librum physicorum, ed Steele et Delorme Oxford, Univ. Press 17s 6d and 30s.
- BOETHIUS, Philosophiae Consolationis Libri, ed Weinberger (Corpus Scriptorum Eccles Lat)
- FRIEDMAN, L. M., Robert Grosseteste and the Jews (De Cessatione Legalum). Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses 10s 6d.
- LOT, F., Nennius et l'Historia Brittonum (Bibl. de l'École des Hautes Études). Paris, Champion. 65 fr.
- SÁINZ DE ROBLES, F., Elipando y San Beato de Liébana. Madrid, Bolaños y Agular 6 ptas.

## Italian.

- Annual Reports of the Dante Society (Harvard). Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses 3s 6d.
- APOLLONTO, M., Uomini e forme nella cultura italiana delle origini Florence, Sansoni. L. 20
- ARIOSTO, Orlando Furioso, ed. Mazzoni 2 vols Florence, Nemi
- BASSERMANN, A., Fur Dante und gegen seine falschen Apostel. Buhl, Konkordia. 2 M 20
- BIANCONI, P., Carducci Florence, Nemi L. 12.
- BRUERS, A., Gabriele D' Annunzio, il pensiero e l' azione. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 15.
- BUKAČEK, J., Francesco Petrarca e la nazione boema Trieste, Reale Università.
- CALDERINI, EMMA, Il Costume popolare in Italia Milan, Sperling e Kupfer L. 400.
- CELLINI, B., Il teatro di Pirandello. Roma, Edizioni Museo L. 5
- COLONNA, G. A. e E. CHIORANDO, Il Processo dei Cenci. Milan, Mondadori L. 7.
- CROCE, B., Varietà di storia letteraria e civile, I (Scritti di storia letteraria e politica). 10s. 6d.
- D' ANNUNZIO, G., Il Fiore delle Laudi, ed F. Flora Milan, Mondadori. L. 12.
- DANTE, Il Convivio, ed. G. Busnelli e G. Vandelli (Opere, iv). Florence, Le Monnier. L. 60.
- DE AMICIS, E., Cuore. Milan, Treves. L. 8.
- FIMIANI, R., Lirici italiani nel Cinquecento—Lirici italiani nel Settecento. Milan, Signorelli. L. 6.
- FOSCOLO, U., Poesie e saggi di prose, ed E. Carrara. Milan, Vallardi. L. 6.
- GIROBERTI, V., Pagine politiche e letterarie, ed L. De Regibus. Milan, Vallardi. L. 3.
- GRIMM, H., Michel-Ange et son temps (Coll. Historique). Paris, Payot 30 fr.
- GUSMAN, P., Rome, II. La Rome du moyen âge et de la renaissance; La Rome moderne, illust. Paris, Arthaud. 95 fr.
- HAGE, LISELOTTE, Lo Cunto de li cunti di Giambattista Basile. Eine Stilstudie. Diss. Tubingen.
- HAUMER, H., Syntax und Flexion des Verbums in den agulanischen Chroniken (Berliner Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie, iv, 4). Jena, Gronau 6 M.
- HUTTON, J., The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800 (Cornell Studies in English, xxiii). Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 13s. 6d.
- LEONETTI, P., Storia della tecnica del verso italiano. Naples, Messano L. 14.
- MACHIAVELLI, N., The Prince, trans. by L. Ricci, revised by E. R. P. Vincent (World's Classics). London: H. Milford. 2s.
- MARSHALL, R., Italy in English Literature, 1755-1815. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 17s. 6d.
- MIGNON, M., Littérature italienne chrétienne. Paris, Bloud et Gay. 12 fr.
- MONTI, V., Poesie, ed. Bustico (Classici Italiani). Turin, Paravia. L. 9.
- ORIGO, IRIS, Giacomo Leopardi. Oxford, Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.

- PETRARCA, Le Familiari, II, 5-9, ed V Rossi (Ediz Nazionale) Florence, Sansoni L 50
- ROHLFS, G., Dizionario dialettale delle tre Calabrie, II, 7. MA-MUJVOLO Halle, Niemeyer 2 M 80
- SCHUEVERMEYER, P., Wasser- und Weingefasse im heutigen Italien Bern, Francke. 5 M 60
- SCHIAFFINI, A., Tradizione e poesia nella prosa d' arte italiana della latinità medioevale a G. Boccaccio Genoa, Emighano degli Orfini L 15
- TASSO, T., Gerusalemme liberata, ed Mazzoni Florence, Nemi.
- VALSECCHI, F., Italienisches Geistesleben zur Zeit Napoleons (Antrittsvorlesung an der Univ Wien am 25 Mai 1934) Vienna, from the author
- VARRASSI, G. A., Amello Calcara, poeta cristiano Casalbordino, De Arcangelis. L 5
- VICINELLI, A., La Letteratura d' Italia, II, 1. Dall' umanesimo al rinascimento. Milan, Vallardi L 15.
- WAGNER, F., Dante in Deutschland: sein staatlich-kirchliches Bild von 1417-1699. Diss. Weimar, Bohlau.

**Spanish, Catalan, Basque.**

- ALBERTI, R., Poesía 1924-30 Madrid, Cruz y Raya 8 ptas.
- Almanaque literario, 1935 Madrid, Plutarco 10 ptas.
- ALONSO, A., El Problema de la lengua en América. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 5 ptas
- ALONSO CORTÉS, N., Las Cien mejores poesías del siglo XIX. Valladolid, Aguado. 3 ptas
- AMADEO, O. R., Vidas argentinas (Rivadavia, etc ) Buenos Aires, López 10 ptas.
- AMEZÚA, A. G. DE, Un Enigma descifrado: el raptor de la hija de Lope de Vega. Madrid, Tip. de Archivos 10 ptas
- ASÍN PALACIOS, M., La Espiritualidad de Algazel y su sentido cristiano, I. Madrid, Maestre. 25 ptas
- AZAÑA, M., La Invención del Quijote y otros ensayos (incl. 'Tres generaciones del Ateneo', 'Valera', 'El secreto de Valle-Inclán'). Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 5 ptas.
- BOADES, Feys d'armes de Catalunya, II (Els Nostres Clàssics, 46-47) Barcelona, Barcino. 15 ptas
- BRICEÑO, OLGA, Bolívar, libertador Madrid, Af 5 ptas
- CARBIA, R., Historia de la historiografía argentina (Bibl Humanidades, II). La Plata, López.
- CARBIA, R., La Crónica oficial de las Indias Occidentales (Bibl Humanidades, XIV). La Plata, López 12 ptas
- CERVANTES, Don Quijote, I, II (Facsimiles of first editions) (Col Tesoro). Madrid, Biblioteca Nueva 70 ptas.
- CERVANTES, Viaje del Parnaso, ed Rodríguez Marín Madrid, Bermejo 30 ptas.
- CHABÁS, J., Vuelo y Estilo, I (Miró, J. Ramón Jiménez, A. Machado, M. Machado). Madrid, Soc. Gen Española de Librería 6 ptas
- Consolat de Mar, III (Els Nostres Clàssics, 41). Barcelona, Barcino 7.50 ptas.
- COTARELO, E., Historia de la zarzuela. Madrid, Archivos 30 ptas
- COTARELO VALLEDOR, A., Cancionero de Payo Gómez Charriño. Madrid, Góngora. 10 ptas.
- DOMÍNGUEZ BERRUETA, J., Santa Teresa de Jesús. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 6 ptas.
- ENTRAMBASAGUAS, J. DE, Poesías nuevas de Lope de Vega, en parte autobiográficas. Madrid, Artes Gráficas. 15 ptas
- FABRA, P., El Català literari. Barcelona, Barcino 5 ptas.
- FIGUEROA, A. DE, La Condesa de Merlín, musa del romanticismo Madrid, Pueyo. 6 ptas.
- GEIGEL Y ZENÓN, J., Bibliografía puertorriqueña, escrita en 1892-4. Barcelona, Garrofé 18 ptas.
- GONZÁLEZ DE LA CALLE, U., Contribución al estudio de la primera versión castellana de la Eneida.

- GUIMERA, A., *Epistolari*. Barcelona, Barcino. 5 ptas
- HAGEDORN, MARIA, *Reformation und spanische Andachtsliteratur Luis de Granada in England* (Kolner anglistische Arbeiten, 21). Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 8 M 80.
- HENRÍQUEZ DE JORQUERA, F., *Anales de Granada, 1482-92, 1588-1646*, ed A Marín Ocete 2 vols Granada, Traveset 50 ptas
- Historia Troyana* texto de hacia 1270, ed R. Menéndez Pidal y E. Varon Vallejo (RFE, anejo xviii) Madrid, Aguirre 15 ptas.
- Iniciadors de la Renaixença* (Els) Barcelona, Barcino 5 ptas.
- JESCHKE, H., *Die Generation von 1898 in Spanien* (ZRP, Beih. 83) Halle, Niemeyer 5 M.
- LAPARRA, R., *Bizet et l'Espagne* Paris, Delagrave 30 fr.
- LEPROUX, M., *Le Général Dupont, le glorieux vaincu de Baylen* Paris, Berger-Levrault 40 fr.
- Libro de Alexandre*, ed by R. S. Wilhs, Jr. (Elliott Monographs, 32) Princeton, Univ Press. \$5.
- LINNHOF, LIESELOTTE, *Spanische Protestanten und England* (Juan de Valdés, etc.). Emsdetten, Lechte. 3 M.
- LLULL, R., *Libre de les Meravelles, III-IV* (Els Nostres Clàssics). Barcelona, Barcino 15 ptas.
- MARAGALL, J., *Obres completes, xv-xviii* Barcelona, Sala Parés 24 50 ptas
- MARASSO, A., *Rubén Darío y su creación poética* (Bibl Humanidades, xiii). La Plata, López. 15 ptas.
- MARQUINA, E., *La Dorotea* comedia en verso inspirada en la famosa obra de Lope de Vega Madrid, Reus 5 ptas
- MASPONS, F., *Lo Rondallaire* Barcelona, Barcino 5 ptas.
- MATEU I LLOPIS, F., *Les Relacions del principat de Catalunya i els regnes de València i Mallorca amb Inglaterra (segles XIII-XV)* Castellón, Armengot. 8 ptas
- MEJÍA, P., *Silva de varia lección, II*. Santander, Aldus 20 ptas.
- MENDIBURU, M. DE, *Diccionario histórico-biográfico del Perú*, VIII. 2 ed. Lima, Gil. 30 ptas
- MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, M., *Introducción y programa de literatura española*, ed. M. Artigas Madrid. 5 ptas.
- MERCHÁN, J. M., *Don Bartolomé José Gallardo* Madrid, Prieto 6 ptas.
- MONTERDE, F., *Bibliografía del teatro en México*. Mexico, Impr Secretaria Rel. Exteriores 15 ptas
- Novel·letes exemplars*, ed. R. Aramon i Serra (Els Nostres Clàssics, 48). Barcelona, Barcino. 7 50 ptas.
- OBRADOR, B., *Las Repúblicas hispanoamericanas* (Manuales Gallach, 70-71). Madrid, Espasa-Calpe 8 ptas
- ONÍS, F. DE, *Antología de la poesía española e hispanoamericana, 1882-1932* Madrid, Centro de Estudios Históricos. 27 ptas.
- ORTEGA, M. L., *Los Hebreos en Marruecos*. Madrid, Af. 6 ptas.
- PALAU CASAMITJANA, FRANCISCA, *Ramón de la Cruz und der französische Kultur-einfluss im Spanien des XVIII. Jhs.* Bonn, Rohrscheid. 4 M 80
- PAR, A., *Shakespeare en la Literatura Española*. 2 vols. Madrid, Suárez, Barcelona, Balmes. 6 ptas
- PAZ, J., *Documentos relativos a España existentes en los archivos nacionales de París* Madrid, Maestre. 20 ptas.
- PEREDA, J. M. DE, *Obras completas* (omnibus volume). Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 60 ptas.
- PHIELER, W., *Volkskundliches aus den Marken* (Studien zum VKR, xvii). Hamburg, Roman Seminar 4 M
- RAMÓN Y CAJAL, S., *El Mundo visto a los 80 años*. Madrid, Tip Artística. 6 ptas.
- Revista hispánica moderna* (Boletín del Instituto de las Españas), ed. F. de Onís, I, 1 Per annum \$4. Bibliography alone \$1.
- RIBA, C., *Proses triades*. Barcelona, Barcino. 5 ptas.

- RODRÍGUEZ MARÍN, F., Los 6666 refranes de mi última rebusca. Madrid, Bermejo. 12 ptas
- RODRÍGUEZ MARÍN, F., Zorrilla, comentador póstumo de sus biógrafos. Madrid, Bermejo. 5 ptas
- SÁNCHEZ CANTÓN, F. J., Fuentes literarias del arte español, III: siglos XVII y XVIII. Madrid, Bermejo. 25 ptas.
- SÁNCHEZ ESTÉVAN, I., Mariano José de Larra. Madrid, Hernando. 6 ptas
- SÁNCHEZ GOZALBO, A., El Paisatge en la literatura valenciana. Castellón, Armengot. 2 ptas.
- SOLDEVILA, F., Història de Catalunya, I. Barcelona, Alpha. 15 ptas
- Teatre català anterior a Pitarra. Barcelona, Barcino. 5 ptas
- Usatges de Barcelona (Els Nostres Clàssics, 43-44). Barcelona, Barcino. 15 ptas.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, Cancionero divino. Madrid, Huelves. 3 ptas.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, Cancionero teatral, ed. J. Robles Pazos. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ Presses. 6s
- VEGA, LOPE DE, La Circe con otras rimas y prosas (facsimile) (Col. Tesoro). Madrid, Biblioteca Nueva. 40 ptas
- [VEGA, LOPE DE], Fénix: revista del tercentenario de Lope de Vega. Madrid, Prieto. To publish six numbers for 25 ptas.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, Perro del Hortelano, ed. E. Kohler (Fac. Lettres, Strasbourg). Paris, Belles Lettres. 20 fr.
- VERA, F., Historia de la matemática en España. 4 vols. Madrid, Suárez. 33 ptas.
- VERGARA MARTÍN, G. M., Coplas y romances que cantan los mozos en algunos pueblos de Castilla la Vieja. Madrid, Hernando. 4 ptas.
- VILANOVA, E., Pobrets i alegrets. Barcelona, Barcino. 5 ptas
- VINDEL, F., Los Bibliófilos y bibliotecas. Madrid, Góngora. 5 ptas
- WAXMAN, S. M., A Bibliography of the belles-lettres of Venezuela. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses.

### Portuguese.

- AMZALAK, M. B., Trois précurseurs portugais. Santarém, Freitas, Veiga. Paris, Sirey. 15 fr.
- Lettres d'amour de la religieuse portugaise. Paris, Hazan. 18 fr.
- NEMÉSIO, V., A Mocidade de Herculano. 2 vols. Lisbon, Bertrand.

### Rumanian, Rhetoromance.

- Dacoromania, VII. Bucharest, Imprimeria Națională. 650 lei.
- Grai și Suflăt, VI. Bucharest, Socec.
- KISCH, G., Reflexe romanisch-germanischer Kulturberührungen im Wortschatze des Gotischen und Rumanischen. Hermannstadt, Honterus.

### French, Provençal.

(Place of publication is Paris, unless otherwise stated.)

#### (a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- ANDRIEU, P., Quelques textes normands des Décrétales de Grégoire IX. Sirey. 4 fr.
- CASSOU, J., Pour la Poésie. Corrêa. 20 fr
- COVILLE, A., and H. TEMPERLEY, Studies in Anglo-French History. 2 vols. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 8s. 6d
- DUBSKY, Ota, Sur quelques particularités dans l'emploi du cas régime et du cas prépositionnel dans la fonction du complément adnominal. Champion. 6 fr.
- ETTMAYER, K., Analytische Syntax der französischen Sprache, II, 9. Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M
- HARRISON, RUTH, An Approach to French Poetry. London, Gollancz. 3s. 6d.
- HONNORAT, M., La Langue gauloise ressuscitée. Leroux. 40 fr.
- HUGUET, E., L'Évolution des sens des mots depuis le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Droz. 30 fr.

- Illustration du livre français de 1478 à 1934 Bulletin Officiel des Maîtres Imprimeurs 70 fr
- KOCH, W., Die Stellung des Objekts im Französischen Diss. Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus
- KONIG, W., Die Präfixe dis-, de- und ex- im Galloromanischen (Berliner Beiträge) Jena, Gronau.
- LERCH, E., Historische französische Syntax, III. Leipzig, Reisland 29 M 40
- MARTIN-DAYDÉ, G., Comment employer les modes et les temps du verbe français Nathan. 15 fr
- MEYER-LÜBKE, W., Historische Grammatik der französischen Sprache, I Laut- und Flexionslehre (Samml. roman. Elementarbücher) Heidelberg, Winter (reissue, minor changes) 5 M.
- PÉROUSE, G., Causeries sur l'histoire littéraire de la Savoie. 2 vols Dardiel 50 fr
- PEYRE, H., La Royauté et les langues provinciales Peyre 30 fr
- PIJOAN, M., A Short History of French Renaissance Medicine. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses
- Questionnaire (Fragebuch für Mundartenaufnahmen, nach Sachgruppen geordnet) Leipzig, Roman. Seminar. 4 M 50
- RICHTER, ELISE, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Romanismen, I Chronologische Phonetik des Französischen bis zum Ende des 8. Jhs (ZRP, Beih. 82) Halle, Niemeyer 28 M
- SABIN, ILSE, Die Bezeichnungen der Streu im Galloromanischen. Diss. Bottrop, Postberg
- THOMASSON, Lt.-Col. DE, Naissance et vicissitudes de 300 mots et locutions. Delagrave. 10 fr
- TOBLER-LOMMATZSCH, Altfranzösisches Wörterbuch, Lfg 17: DESAVANCEOR-DESONORANCE. Berlin, Weidmann

(b) *Old French*

- ADAM LE BOSSU, Jeu de Robin et Marion, Jeu du Pèlerin Transposition de G. Cohen. Delagrave. 12 fr.
- AMET, M. L., La Condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc. Nouv. Éd. Latines 20 fr
- BRUEL, A., Romans français du moyen âge. Droz.
- GROU, J., Trencavalet et le drame albigeois. Roger. 15 fr.
- GUITAUD, J., Histoire de l'Inquisition au moyen âge (Cathares et Vaudois). Picard 55 fr.
- HEIDEL, G., La langue et le style de Philippe de Commines (Leipziger Romanische Studien, VIII). Leipzig, Roman. Seminar 8 M
- PAUPHILLET, A., Chrestien de Troyes Le manuscrit d'Annonay. Droz 40 fr
- ROHRBACH, MARTHA, Christine von Pisan. Diss. Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus
- SOUPAULT, R., Le Danse Macabre. Floury 10 fr.
- SZAROTA, ELIDA MARIA, Studien zu Gautier de Comcy. Diss. Limburg, Limburger Vereinsdr.

(c) *Modern French*

- AMIEL, D., Théâtre, v. Michel 12 fr.
- ASCOLI, G., Réponse à quelques détracteurs de Victor Hugo. Droz. 10 fr.
- BAINVILLE, J., Histoire de la troisième république. Fayard 15 fr.
- BALAS, L., Scènes et tableaux du règne de Louis XIII. Gautier-Languereau. 12 fr.
- BAUDELAIRE, Histoires extraordinaires. Lemerre. 4 fr.
- BAUDELAIRE, Petits poèmes en prose. Plon. 20 fr.
- BAUSSAN, C., De Frédéric le Play à Paul Bourget. Flammarion. 12 fr
- BORÉLY, MARTHE, Barbey d'Aurevilly. Les Marges. 15 fr.
- BRUNET, G., Victor Hugo (Maîtres des Littératures). Rieder. 16 fr
- BUCHSENSCHÜTZ, H., Balzac im Spiegel seines Briefwechsels. Diss. Berlin, Pfau.

- CHÉNIER, Poésies (Coll des Dames) Michel. 3 fr.  
 DAUDET, Fontvielle et les moulins d'Alphonse Daudet (Soc des Amis des Moulins d'A Daudet) Publ Novia 10 fr  
 DEBRAYE, H., Si Stendhal revenait, illustr Librairie Regionaliste 60 fr  
 EWALD, MARIA, Francis Jammes und der franziskanische Geist Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus  
 FAGUET, E., Histoire de la poesie française, VIII. Les poètes secondaires du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, 1700-50 Boivin 15 fr  
 FÉNELON, Pages nouvelles pour servir à l'étude des origines du quétisme avant 1694, ed M Langlois (Bibl d'Histoire). Desclée de Brouwer 18 fr.  
 FLEURET, F., De Ronsard à Baudelaire Mercure de France. 15 fr.  
 FRANÇON, M., Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche Droz. 30 fr.  
 GAYOT, A., François Guizot et Mme Laure de Gasparins Grasset. 45 fr  
 GRAFE, H., Die Frauengestalten im Werke Honoré de Balzacs Diss. Zeulenroda, Sporn  
 GREEN, F C, Minuet: a critical survey of French and English literary ideas in the eighteenth century. London, Dent. 15s  
 HALLER, E., Chateaubriand als Lyriker. Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus  
 HERBERHOLTZ, MARGARETE, Dichtung und Wahrheit in Flauberts Madame Bovary. Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus  
 HUGO, V., Littérature et philosophie mêlées (Œuvres complètes). Michel. 50 fr.  
 HUNT, H J., Le Socialisme et le Romantisme en France. Étude de la presse socialiste de 1830 à 1848. Oxford, Univ. Press 15s.  
 JAHN, H., Pompée eine bisher unbekannte Tragodie uber den Tod des Pompejus aus dem Jahre 1579. Diss Nurnberg, Bollmann.  
 JOURDA, P., Stendhal, l'homme et l'œuvre (Temps et Visages). Desclée de Brouwer 20 fr.  
 KNORRENSCHILD, W., Die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der Revolutionsdramen Roman Rollands. Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.  
 LABERTHONNIÈRE, Études sur Descartes, ed. L. Canet (Œuvres) 2 vols. 70 fr.  
 LA FAYETTE, Mme DE, La Princesse de Clèves, illustr Plon 20 fr  
 LA FONTAINE, Fables 2 vols Delagrave 10 fr  
 LAMARTINE, Jocelyn (Génie de la France). NRF. 5 fr.  
 LOCHORE, R A., History of the Idea of Civilization in France (1830-70). Bonn, Rohrscheid 6 M.  
 MABILLE DE PONCHEVILLE, A., Valentin Conrat, le père de l'Académie Française. Mercure de France 12 fr  
 MAHIEU, R G., Les Enquêteurs français aux États-Unis de 1830 à 1837 (Bibl. RLC) Champion 25 fr  
 MAINTENON, Mme DE, Lettres, II. 1655-83, ed. Langlois. 30 fr  
 MASSIS, Gide Brescia, Morcelliana L. 8.  
 MAURIAC, F., Blaise Pascal et sa sœur Jacqueline. Grasset 35 fr.  
 MAURIAC, F., La Vie de Jean Racine Grasset 35 fr.  
 MÉLÈSE, P., Le Théâtre et le public à Paris sous Louis XIV—Répertoire analytique des documents concernant le théâtre à Paris sous Louis XIV (Bibl Soc. Historiens du Théâtre). 2 vols. Droz 80 fr.  
 MOREAU, P., L'Histoire en France au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle (Coll. Études fr.) Belles Lettres. 10 fr.  
 PÉGUY, C., Pierre-Marcel: ébauche d'une étude sur Alfred de Vigny. NRF. 33 fr  
 PIÉTRI, F., La Réforme de l'État au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle Éditions de la France 20 fr.  
 PRÉVOST, M., Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité (Bibl. RLC). Champion 30 fr  
 PRÉVOST, M., Clarisse et sa fille (roman inédit). Éditions de la France. 27 fr  
 PROUST, Correspondance générale, v. Plon. 15 fr  
 RAEDERS, G., Le Comte de Gobineau au Brésil Nouv. Éd. Latines. 20 fr.  
 REHFUSS, F., Komposition und Charakteristik der Personen in Stendhals Roman Le Rouge et le Noir. Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.  
 RENAN, E., Prière sur l'Acropole, ed by E. Vinaver and T. B. L. Webster. Manchester, Univ. Press. 2s.



- REYMAN, ELISABETH, Victor Hugos Stellung zur Frau Diss. Coburg, Rosstautscher
- RILKE, R. M., Poèmes français Hartmann 20 fr
- ROY, M., Artistes et monuments de la Renaissance en France, II Picard 80 fr.
- RUMMELSBURG-SULKE, G., Um George Sand Zurich, Rascher 4 M
- SAINT-BEUVE, Correspondance générale, I, ed Bonnerot. Stock 48 fr
- SAINT-LÉGER, A. DE et P. SAGNAC, La Prépondérance française Louis XIV, 1661-1715. (Peuples et Civilisations) Alcan 50 fr.
- SCHOLLMAYER, V., Gustav Flaubert in seinem Verhältnis zu Michel de Montaigne. Diss (Greifswalder Beiträge, V) Greifswald, Dallmeyer. 1 M 80.
- SPALATIN, K., Saint-Evremond Diss. Belles Lettres 12 fr
- STENDHAL, Correspondance, VII-X 1830-42 Le Divan. 100 fr
- THIBAUDET, A., Gustave Flaubert, reprint. Plon. 15 fr
- TIGERMANN, F., Paul Verlaine Zusammenhänge zwischen seinem Erleben und seinem Schaffen. Diss Berlin, Alexander-Dr
- TRISTAN, Le Parasite, ed. J. Madaleine. Droz 20 fr
- TRUC, G., Scènes et tableaux du règne de Louis-Philippe et de la III<sup>e</sup> république. Gautier-Languereau 12 fr.
- VALÉRY, P., Analecta. NRF 18 fr.
- VAUVENARGUES, Réflexions et maximes, ed Charbonnel. Croville 12 fr
- VERLAINE, Œuvres complètes. 5 vols Messein 220 fr.
- VERLAINE, Parallèlement Ed de Cluny 30 fr
- VEUILLOT, Mélanges, 1854-6 (Œuvres). Lethellieux 40 fr
- VIVIEN, R., Poésies complètes 2 vols. Lemerre 25 fr
- (d) *Provençal*.
- CROSSEK, H. H., Jean Giono, ein Dichter der Provence Diss Bottrop, Postberg.
- RIPERT, E., Notes et commentaires pour le poème de Mireio, chant I. Belles Lettres. 12 fr.

## GERMANIC LANGUAGES

## Scandinavian.

- Corpus Codicum Islandicorum mediae aevi, ed. E. Munksgaard. Vol VI £5. 12s. 6d.
- Egill Skallagrímsson. Hofudlausn, Sonatorrek, Arnþjarnarkviða. Herausg. von K. Reichardt. (Altnord. Übungstexte, 3) 1 M 60.
- Egillssaga Skallagrímssonar, Ausgewählte Stücke. Herausg. von E. Karg-Gasterstädt (Altnord. Übungstexte, 2.) 1 M 60
- Heimskringla. Einführung des Christentums in Norwegen. Herausg. von A. Heiermeier. (Altnord. Übungstexte, 5) 1 M. 40.
- LUDWIG, W., Untersuchungen über den Entwicklungsgang und die Funktion des Dialogs in der islandischen Saga (Rhein. Beitr. und Hilfsbücher zur germ. Phil. und Volkskunde). 5 M
- Þiðrekssaga. Wieland der Schmied. Herausg. von H. Reuschel. (Altnord. Übungstexte, 4.) 1 M 20

## English.

(a) *General (including Linguistic)*.

- Australian Essays, ed. by G. H. Cowling and F. Maurice Melbourne and Oxford Univ. Presses. 4s. 6d
- BACK, H., The Synonyms for 'Child', 'Boy', 'Girl' in Old English. Lund, Gleerup; London, Williams and Norgate. 10 kr.
- BODKIN, M., Archetypal Patterns in Poetry. Oxford, Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- BULLETT, G., The Story of English Literature Black. 2s. 6d.
- COULTON, G. G., H. W. Fowler (S.P.E. Tract, XLII). Oxford, Clar. Press. 3s. 6d.
- JORDAN-SMITH, P., For the Love of Books. New York, Oxford Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 7s. 6d.
- MÉGROZ, R. L., A Guide to Poetry. Pitman. 5s.

- MEIER, A., Die alttestamentliche Namengebung in England (Kolner anglist. Arbeiten, 22) Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 2 M 50.  
 Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, Vol xxviii, Pt 2. Chicago, Univ Press, London, Cambridge Univ Press 9s.  
 SCHNEIDER, G., Theory and History of Bibliography, translated by R. Shaw. New York, Columbia Univ Press, London, Milford. 18s 6d  
 STEVENSON, B., Stevenson's Book of Quotations London, Cassell. 30s.  
 VALLIUS, G. H., Words in the Making London, Black. 2s 6d  
 WATSON, A (ed.), The Way of Achievement London, Nicholson and Watson 6s.  
 Year's Poetry, The A Representative Selection. Compiled by D. K. Roberts, G. Gould and J. Lehmann. London, Lane. 6s

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- Altenglische Traumgesicht vom Kreuz, Das, ed. by H. Butow (Anglistische Forschungen, 78). Heidelberg, Winter 10 M.  
 HENEL, H., Studien zum altenglischen Computus (Beitrage zur englischen Philologie, xxvi) Leipzig, Tauchnitz 6 M  
 McNABB, V., The Authorship of the Ancien Riwle. Rome, Inst. Hist. Fratrum Prædicatorum  
 Owl and the Nightingale, The, ed by J. H. G. Grattan and G. F. H. Sykes (E.E.T.S., Extra Series, cxix). London, H. Milford. 15s.

(c) *Modern English.*

- ABRAMS, M. H., The Milk of Paradise (Harvard Honors Theses in English, 7). Harvard and Oxford Univ Presses. 5s. 6d.  
 ANGELL, DIEGO, La Vita di Guglielmo Shakespeare. Milan, Treves. 12 L  
 BARBER, G. H. G. Wells' Verhältnis zum Darwinismus (Beitrage zur englischen Philologie, xxvii). Leipzig, Tauchnitz 4 M  
 BINYON, L., The Case of Christopher Smart (English Association Pamphlet, 90). London, H. Milford. 2s.  
 BRADBROOK, M. C., Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.  
 CHARLTON, H. B., Falstaff (Reptd from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library). Manchester, Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.  
 CLARE, JOHN, Poems. Ed. with an introduction by J. W. Tibble 2 vols. London, Dent. 25s.  
 DOUGLAS, M. W., Lord Oxford was Shakespeare London, Rich and Cowan. 6s.  
 DOWSON, ERNEST CHRISTOPHER, Poems. Ed. with an Introduction by D. Flower. London, Cassell and John Lane. 10s 6d  
 England's Helicon, ed by H. E. Rollins. 2 vols Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses 25s.  
 GASKELL, Mrs, Letters addressed to, by Celebrated Contemporaries, now in the possession of the John Rylands Library. Manchester, Univ Press 2s  
 GOLDMAN, M. S., Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press. \$2.25.  
 GORDON, G., Poetry and the Moderns Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2s  
 GREEN, C. C., The Neo-Classic Theory of Tragedy in England during the Eighteenth Century (Harvard Studies in English, xi). Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 11s. 6d.  
 HARBAGE, A., Sir William Davenant. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 13s. 6d.  
 HARRIS, R., Wordsworth's Lucy. London, Univ. Press 2s.  
 HERRICK, R., Poems London, H. Milford. 2 vols. 15s  
 HICKS, G., The Great Tradition. An Interpretation of American Literature since the Civil War. New York, Macmillan Co 10s. 6d.  
 History of the Times, The. The Thunderer in the Making. London, The Times. 15s  
 HOLLIS, C., Sir Thomas More. London, Sheed and Ward. 7s 6d  
 HOLMAN, L. E., Lamb's 'Barbara S—'. The Life of Frances Maria Kelly, Actress. London, Methuen. 6s.

- HOPKINS, G. M., *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges, The Correspondence of Gerard Manley Hopkins and Richard Watson Dixon.* Ed. by C. C. Abbott. London, H. Milford. 2 vols. 30s.
- HORNBEAK, K. G., *The Complete Letter-Writer in English, 1568-1800* (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, xv, 3-4). Northampton, Mass., Smith College. \$1.50.
- IRVING, W., *Journal, 1803*. Ed. by S. T. Williams. Oxford, Univ. Press, London, H. Milford. 12s. 6d.
- JAMES, A. LLOYD, *The Broadcast Word*. London, Kegan Paul. 7s. 6d.
- JOHNSON, E. C., *Lamb Always Elia*. London, Methuen. 7s. 6d.
- JOLIAT, E., *Smollett et la France* (Bibl. Rev. Litt. Comp., 105). Paris, Champion.
- JUDSON, A. C., *A Biographical Sketch of John Young, Bishop of Rochester, with Emphasis on his Relations with Edmund Spenser*. Bloomington, Indiana Univ. 75 cents.
- MARSHALL, R., *Italy in English Literature, 1755-1815*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses; London, H. Milford. 17s. 6d.
- MÉLÈSE, M., *Les Contemporains de Shakespeare II*. Introduction, traductions et notes. Paris, La Renaissance du Livre. 5 fr. 50.
- MORLEY, E. J., *The Life and Times of Henry Crabb Robinson*. London, Dent. 10s. 6d.
- ROPER, W., *Life of More*, ed. by E. V. Hitchcock (E. E. T. S., 197). London, H. Milford. 10s.
- SELLS, I. E., *Matthew Arnold and France*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12s. 6d.
- SHERIDAN, R. B., *The Rivals, First Version*, ed. by R. L. Purdy. Oxford, Univ. Press. 21s.
- SHERWOOD, M., *Undercurrents of Influence in English Romantic Poetry*. Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 15s.
- SIMPSON, P., *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Oxford, Univ. Press. 45s.
- STERNE, L., *Letters*, ed. by L. P. Curtis. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 30s.
- SWIFT, J., *Gulliver's Travels, and Select Writings in Prose and Verse*. London, Nonesuch Press. 8s. 6d.
- SWIFT, J., *Letters to Charles Ford*, ed. by D. Nichol Smith. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15s.
- THIELKE, K. L. F., *Literatur- und Kunstkritik in ihren Wechselbeziehungen* (Studien zur englischen Philologie, lxxxiv). Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M. 80.
- THIEME, H., *Zur Verfasserfrage des Dekkerschen Stückes 'The Pleasant Comedy of Old Fortunatus'*. Dresden, Risse.
- THRALL, M. M. H., *Rebellious Fraser's*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses, London, H. Milford. 15s.
- VON STUTTERHEIM, K., *The Press in England*, translated by W. H. Johnston. London, Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.
- Welbeck Miscellany, The. 1. *A Pleasant & Merrye Humor off a Roge*. By William Cavendish. 2. *A Collection of Poems by Several Hands*. Welbeck Abbey, The Librarian; London, Dobell. 3s. 6d. each.
- WHITE, B., *An Index to 'The Elizabethan Stage' and 'William Shakespeare a study of facts and problems'* by Sir Edmund Chambers. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21s.
- WHITE, H. O., *Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance* (Harvard Studies in English, xi). Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 10s. 6d.
- WIDENMANN, H., *Neuengland in der erzählenden Literatur Amerikas* (Studien zur englischen Philologie, lxxxvi). Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.
- WILSON, J., *The Cheats*, ed. by M. C. Nahm. Oxford, Blackwell. 10s. 6d.
- WYCHERLEY, W., *The Country Wife*. London, Hutchinson. 31s. 6d.
- ZUNDER, T. A., *The Early Days of Joel Barlow, a Connecticut Wit*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses; London, H. Milford. 9s.

**German.***(a) General (including Linguistic).*

- BRIEGLER, O., Vom Aufbau unseres Wortschatzes Leipzig, Brandstetter 3 M. 60.  
 DIEWERGE, H., Jakob Grimm und das Fremdwort (Form und Geist, 34). Leipzig, Eichblatt. 11 M. 60  
 Ein Mittelostfälisches Gebetbuch, herausg. von E. Lofstedt. Lund, Gleerup.  
 Germanisch-Romanische Studien, Prof. H. Suolahti zum 60. Geb. Helsinki. 1934  
 HEIDRICH, W., Die deutsche Sprache in Danemark (Mitteilungen der Deutschen Akademie)  
 JØRGENSEN, P., Die dithmarsche Mundart von Klaus Groths 'Quickborn'. Copenhagen, Levin und Munksgaard 10 kr  
 OHMANN, E., Über Homonymie und Homonyme im Deutschen (Annales Acad. Scientiarum Fennicae, Bd 32, 1)  
 Plattdeutsche Rechtschreibungslehre für die Mundarten des nordniedersächsischen Raumes, ed. by C. Borchling. Hamburg, Wachholtz 1 M.  
 RAWOLLE, E., Mundart und Kolonisation in der Sachsisch-Böhmischen Schweiz. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M. 80.  
 VIETOR, W., Die Aussprache des Schriftdeutschen 12. durchgesehene Aufl. besorgt von E. A. Meyer Leipzig, Reisland. 2 M. 40.  
 WUSTMANN, G., Sprachdummheiten, in der 10. Aufl. vollst. erneuert von Werner Schulze. Berlin, W. de Gruyter. 2 M. 80

*(b) Old and Middle High German.*

- AMORETTI, G. V., Il 'Tristan' di Gottfried von Strassburg 6s 6d.  
 DITTMAR, H., Das Christusbild in der deutschen Dichtung der Cluniazenserzeit (Erlanger Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur). 4 M  
 EBERTH, Fr., Die Minne- und Meistergesangsweisen der Kolmarer Liederhandschrift, ein Beitrag zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der deutschen Liedweise im 14 bis 16. Jahrhundert 4 M.  
 EHRLSMANN, G., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang der Mittelalters. Teil II, Mittelhochdeutsche Literatur, Schlussband. Munich, Beck. 24 M.  
 GERSTMAYER, G., Walther von der Vogelweide im Wandel der Jahrhunderte (Germanistische Abhandlungen) 10 M.  
 GOETZ, M. P., The Concept of Nobility in German Didactic Literature of the Thirteenth Century Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America  
 GUDDÉ, E. G., Social Conflicts in Medieval German Poetry (Univ. of California Publications in Modern Philology, xviii, 1). California and Cambridge University Presses 7s  
 MERTENS, K., Die Konstanzer Minnelehre (Germanische Studien) 4 M. 50  
 SCHEUNEMANN, E., 'Mai und Beafior' und H. von Buhel's 'Königstochter von Frankreich', eine vergleichende Untersuchung zur Darstellung im hohen und späten Mittelalter (Deutschkundliche Arbeiten). 4 M. 50  
 SCHMITZ, W., Traum und Vision in der erzählenden Dichtung des deutschen Mittelalters (Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung). 3 M. 40.

*(c) Modern German.*

- AYRAULT, R., Heinrich von Kleist. Paris, Nizet und Bastard. 60 fr  
 AYRAULT, R., La légende de Heinrich von Kleist. Un poète devant la critique. Paris, Nizet et Bastard. 20 fr  
 AZMI, M., Graf Adolf Friedrich von Schack und der Orient (Germanische Studien, 157). Berlin, Ebering 4 M. 80.  
 BACH, H., Laut- und Formenlehre der Sprache Luthers. Copenhagen, Levin und Munksgaard. 4 kr.  
 BLANCK, H., Hermann Lons. Oldenburg, Stalling 1 M. 20.  
 BLUNCK, H. F., Mein Leben, einige Aufzeichnungen. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt 1 M. 80.  
 BROD, M., Heinrich Heine. Vienna, Tal. 6 M. 75.

- BRODERSEN, A., Stefan George Deutscher und Europaer Berlin, Verlag Die Runde. 2 M 50
- BRUFORD, W. H., Germany in the eighteenth century Cambridge, University Press 15s
- BUDDECKE, W., Verzeichnis von Jakob Bohme-Handschriften (Hainbergschriften, 1) Göttingen, Hantzschel 8 M
- BUSCH, E., Stiltypen der deutschen freirhythmischen Hymne aus dem religiösen Erleben (Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur germanischen und romanischen Philologie, 6) Frankfurt a M., Diesterweg 3 M 80
- CASPER, S., Der Dramatiker Hanns Johst. Munich, Langen und Müller 1 M
- COTTA, Briefe an Cotta 3, Vom Vormarz bis Bismarck 1833-63 Hg von H. Schiller Stuttgart, Berlin, Cotta. 11 M
- DEHN, F., Rainer Maria Rilke und sein Werk Eine Deutung Leipzig, Insel 6 M.
- DEMPE, A., Meister Eckhart Leipzig, Hegner 5 M. 50
- DEUBEL, W., Schillers Kampf um die Tragödie Umriss eines neuen Schillerbildes Berlin-Lichterfelde, Widukund-Verlag 1 M 30
- DREYER, A., Johann Matthias Dreyer 1717-69 Ein Hamburger satirischer Dichter und Holstein-Gottorper Diplomat. (Veröffentlichungen des Vereins für Hamburgische Geschichte, 8.) Hamburg, Christians 4 M 50.
- DSCHENTZIG, T., Stefan George und die Jugend Munich, Bruckmann 1 M 20.
- DÜREN, W., Goethe widerlegt Spengler Bonn, Rohrscheid 4 M 20
- ENGEL, C., Studien zum Dichterbegriff und zur poetischen Anschauung der Heidelberger Romantiker Würzburg, Tritsch 3 M
- ERMATINGER, E., Deutsche Kultur im Zeitalter der Aufklärung H. 1. (Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte, Lfg. 10) Potsdam, Athenaeon 2 M 80
- FEHR, M., Richard Wagners Schweizer Zeit. Bd 1 1849-55 Aarau, Leipzig, Sauerländer 11 M 50
- FRELS, W., Deutsche Dichterhandschriften von 1400-1900 Gesamtkatalog der eigenhändigen Handschriften deutscher Dichter in den Bibliotheken und Archiven Deutschlands, Österreichs, der Schweiz und der ČSR. (Bibliographical Publications, Germanic Section, Modern Language Association of America, Vol. 2.) Leipzig, Hiersemann 45 M.
- FRELS, W., Goetheschrifttum des Goethejahres. Deutschsprachige Bücher und Aufsätze, 1932 Weimar, Duncker. 36 M
- GEBHARDT, P. VON, Ahnentafeln des Dichters Friedrich von Schiller und seines Urenkels Alexander Reichsfreiherrn von Gleichen-Rußwurm (Ahnentafeln berühmter Deutscher, Lfg. 11). Leipzig, Zentralstelle für Deutsche Personen- und Familiengeschichte
- GEELLEN, A. VAN, Martin Greif als Dramatiker in seinen Beziehungen zu Laube und zum Burgtheater unter Wilbrandt und Dingelstedt (Deutsche Quellen und Studien, 11) Graz, Wächter 13 M 35.
- GERSTMAYER, G., Walther von der Vogelweide im Wandel der Jahrhunderte (Germanistische Abhandlungen, 68). Breslau, Marcus 10 M.
- GRUNER, V., Schleiermacher und die Dorpater Theologie Gutersloh, Bertelsmann. 1 M
- HEINZE, R., Die Kulturauffassung Schleiermachers nach der 'Ethik' und der 'Christlichen Sitte'. Gotha, Koltz. 2 M.
- HELLWIG, E., Morphologischer Idealismus und neue Lyrikdeutung (Mnemosyne, 17) Bonn, Rohrscheid. 3 M. 25.
- HERRMANN, H., Der Gegenwartigkeitsgedanke in der theoretischen Behandlung des dramatischen Kunstwerks bei Lessing, A. W. Schlegel und Hegel (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, B, Bd. 8). Breslau, Priebatsch. 3 M 20
- HORNEFFER, E., Nietzsche als Vorbote der Gegenwart. Düsseldorf, Bagel. 1 M 50.
- HOUBEN, H. H., Goethes Eckermann. Vienna, Zsolnay. 5 M. 50.
- HUMBOLDT, W. VON, Wilhelm und Caroline von Humboldt in ihren Briefen 1788-1835. Hg. von A. von Sydow. Gekürzte Volksausgabe in 1 Band. 2. Aufl. Berlin, Mittler. 4 M. 80.

- Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts 1932-3. Hg von E Beutler. Halle, Niemeyer
- Jahrbuch der Paul Ernst-Gesellschaft 1933-4 Berlin-Steglitz, Paul Ernst-Gesellschaft 1 M 80
- KAHN, L W, Shakespeares Sonette in Deutschland Bern, Gotthelf. 6 fr
- KATANN, O, Katholsche Literaturbetrachtung Wesen und Genesis (Berichte zur Kultur und Zeitgeschichte, 11.) Vienna, Reinhold. 1 M 30
- KLEIN, C A, Die Sendung Stefan Georges Erinnerungen Berlin, Die Rabenpresse 2 M 40
- KLEMM, G, Christian Morgensterns Dichtungen von 'Ich und Du' (Mnemosyne, 12) Bonn, Rohrscheid 3 M
- KLUCKHOHN, P, Die Idee des Volkes im Schrifttum der deutschen Bewegung von Moser und Herder bis Grimm (Literarhistorische Bibliothek, 13). Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt 4 M.
- KOMMERELL, M, Schiller als Gestalter des handelnden Menschen (Wissenschaft und Gegenwart, 6) Frankfurt a M, Klostermann 1 M 75
- KONITZER, W F, Holderlin. Ein Schicksal in Deutschland Oldenburg, Stalling 1 M. 20
- KRETSCHMAR, E, Rilke als Dichter des Seins. Dresden, Risse. 3 M.
- LAGARDE, P DE, Schriften für das deutsche Volk. Bd 1, Deutsche Schriften Bd 2, Ausgewählte Schriften Munich, Lehmann. Each 5 M
- LILIENFEIN, H., Schiller und die deutsche Schillerstiftung Festvortrag zur Feier des 75jährigen Jubiläums der Deutschen Schillerstiftung Weimar, Bohlau 1 M 50.
- LIST, R, Katholische Dichtung in Österreich Ein Wegweiser für Bucherfreunde (Schriftenreihe des österreichischen Bucherverbandes, 1) Vienna, Österreichischer Bucherverband 2 M.
- LOTHAR, R, Das Wiener Burgtheater, ein Wahrzeichen österreichischer Kunst und Kultur Vienna, Argartenverlag 9 M 60
- LUDWIG, O., Tiberius Gracchus. Trauerspiel. Ein Fragment Aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlaß zusammengestellt, mit einer Einleitung und einem Faksimile herausg von F. Richter (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, D, Bd 2) Breslau, Priebatsch 3 M.
- LUTHER, M, Ausgewählte Werke. Hg von H H Borchardt 2 veränderte Ausgabe besorgt von G Merz Bd 6, 7 Munich, Kaiser. Each 6 M
- LUTHER, M, Werke Kritische Gesamtausgabe Briefwechsel Bd 5. Weimar, Bohlau. 43 M 50.
- MARKUS, A, Der Tod Adalbert Stifters (Germanische Studien, 154). Berlin, Ebering 3 M 60
- MEISSINGER, K A., Helena Schillers Anteil am Faust Frankfurt a M., Schulze-Bulmke 4 M.
- MEYER, R, Hecken- und Gartentheater in Deutschland im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert (Die Schaubühne, 6). Emsdetten, Lechte 12 M
- MULLER, J., Das Märchen vom Unibos (Deutsche Arbeiten der Universität Köln) Jena, Diederichs 6 M.
- MULLER, J, Grillparzers Menschenauffassung (Literatur und Leben, 4). Weimar, Bohlau 5 M.
- MULLER-BLATTAT, J, Zur Erforschung des Ostpreussischen Volkshedes Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M 60.
- NAGL, J. W und J ZEIDLER, Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte, ed. by E. Castle III. Band, 12 Abteilung. Vienna, Fromme 8 M 40.
- NIETZSCHE, F, Judentum, Christentum, Deutschtum (Eine Auswahl) Berlin, Steegmann 1 M.
- NIETZSCHE, F, Werke und Briefe. Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe 3. Schriften der Jugendzeit 1864-1867. Munich, Beck 12 M.
- ODEBRECHT, R., Nikolaus von Cues und der deutsche Geist. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Irrationalismusproblems. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 2 M. 80.

- PAUL, A., Der Einfluß Walter Scotts auf die epische Technik Theodor Fontanes (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, B, Bd. 10). Breslau, Priebatsch 6 M. 25.
- PAULSEN, W., Expressionismus und Aktivismus. Bern, Gotthelf. 8 fr
- PETERSEN, C., Der Seher deutscher Volkheit Friedrich Holderlin (Kieler Universitätsreden, N F., 1). Kiel, Lipsius und Tischer. M 0 80.
- RAIMUND, F., Samtliche Werke Historisch-kritische Sakularausgabe Hg. von F. Bruckner und E. Castle (Bd. 1, Dramatische Dichtungen, hg. von M. und E. Castle, T 1) Vienna, Schroll Complete 6 vols. 40 M
- SARAN, F., Deutsche Verskunst. Ein Handbuch für Schule, Sprechsaal, Bühne Unter Mitwirkung von P. Habermann, hg. von A. Rüemann. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt 14 M.
- SCHAEFER, W., Mein Leben, Rechenschaft. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 1 M. 40
- SCHLEGEL, F., Neue philosophische Schriften, erstmals in Druck gelegt, erläutert und mit einer Einleitung in Friedrich Schlegels philosophischen Entwicklungsgang versehen von J. Körner Frankfurt a M., Schulte-Bulmke. 15 M
- SCHOLZ, W. VON, Mein Leben. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 1 M. 60
- SCHREMPF, C., Gesammelte Werke, Bd. 9. Auseinandersetzungen 3, Sokrates, Nietzsche, Paulus. Stuttgart, Frommann. 12 M
- SCHULTZ, F., Klassik und Romantik der Deutschen 1 Teil Grundlagen der klassisch-romantischen Literatur. Stuttgart, Metzler 9 M 50.
- SEIDEL, I., Dichter, Volkstum und Sprache. Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt. 4 M. 25.
- SIMON, L., Verantwortung und Schuld in Goethes Roman (Erlanger Arbeiten zur Deutscher Literatur, 2) Erlangen, Palm und Enke 3 M.
- SMITH, P., A History of Modern Culture. Vol. 2 The Enlightenment, 1687-1776. New York, Holt. \$4.
- SPORRI, R., Es sprach der Geist. C. F. Meyers religiöse Botschaft. Stuttgart, Verlag der Christengemeinschaft 1 M 80.
- STEHR, H., Mein Leben. Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 1 M. 40
- STOCKUM, T. C. VAN and DAM, J. VAN, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Bd. 1. Von den Anfängen bis zum 18. Jahrhundert. Groningen, Walters; Leipzig, Harrassowitz 11 M.
- UNGER, R., Gervinus und die Anfänge der politischen Literaturgeschichtsschreibung in Deutschland Eine Sakularerinnerung (Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Fachgruppe 4 N.F. Bd. 1, Nr. 5) Berlin, Weidmann. 1 M
- VOIGT, F. A., Antike und antikes Lebensgefühl in Werke Gerhart Hauptmanns (Deutschkundliche Arbeiten, B, Bd. 5). Breslau, Maruschke und Berendt. 4 M. 50.
- WADEPUHL, W., Goethe's Interest in the New World. Jena, Frommann. 3 M.
- WAGNER, Cosima Wagner and Houston Stewart Chamberlain im Briefwechsel. 1888-1908 Hg. von P. Pretzsch. Leipzig, Reclam. 9 M
- WALDECKER, L., Schillerstudien. Bonn, Rohrscheid. 3 M.
- WECKMÜLLER, A., Heines Stil (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker, B, Bd. 11) Breslau, Priebatsch 6 M.
- WEISS, F., Das Basler Stadttheater, 1834-1934. Gedenkschrift zum 100jährigen Bestehen. Basel, Schwabe. 8 M.
- WIEHE, E., Gottlieb Mohnike als Vermittler und Übersetzer nordischer Literatur (Nordische Studien, 15). Greifswald, Bamberg. 3 M.
- WOLFSKEHL, M. L., Die Jesusminne in der Lyrik des deutschen Barock (Gießener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, 34). Gießen, Munchow. 8 M. 50.
- WOOD, F. H., Jr., Heine as a Critic of his own works. New York, Stechert.
- ZIEMANN, E., Heinrich Laube als Theaterkritiker (Die Schaubühne, 4). Emsdetten, Lechte. 3 M. 50.

## 'THE MURDER OF GONZAGO'

A Probable Source for *Hamlet*

MORE than one attempt has been made to discover the source of *The Murder of Gonzago* G Sarrazin (*Sh Jahrbuch*, 1895, pp. 169 f) saw in it allusions to the murder, on May 7, 1592, of the Marchese Alfonso Gonzaga di Castelgoffredo, whose nephew, the Marchese Rudolfo di Castiglione, sent eight assassins to slay him as he was resting at mid-day. Alfonso left a widow Hippolyta and a daughter Caterina; Rudolfo was himself murdered in January 1593. Here was a Gonzaga murder instigated by a nephew (cp. Lucianus, 'Nephew to the king') and carried out at about the same time of day. The victim's name, Alfonsus, might easily, Sarrazin argued, be perverted to Albertus (Q 1) by the faulty expansion of a MS. abbreviation (Al). The parallels, however, were slight.

Another suggestion was made by Dowden in his note on III, ii, 252:

In 1538 the Duke of Urbino (*sic*), married to a Gonzaga, was murdered by Luigi Gonzaga, who dropped poison into his ear.

As Professor Dover Wilson noted (*Hamlet*, xxiii).

Dowden unfortunately omits his authority, but *The Murder of Gonzago* bears all the marks of being founded upon an Italian original; and I see no reason for doubting that Hamlet's words at III, ii, 362, 'The story is extant, and written in very choice Italian', were substantially correct.

In an attempt to find this missing source, I have explored Dowden's tantalising suggestion, and, although Hamlet's 'story' still eludes me, I believe that in the circumstances surrounding the death of Francesco Maria I della Rovere, Duke of Urbino, we may well see the ultimate origin, not only of the play within the play, but of other elements in the plot of *Hamlet*.

Francesco Maria was the first of the new line which succeeded the Montefeltri in Urbino. Born in 1490, he had an adventurous career, which has been described in some detail by Dennistoun in his *Memoirs of the Dukes of Urbino* (1851, new ed. 1909). In 1505 he was affianced to Leonora, daughter of the Marchese Francesco Gonzaga and Isabella d'Este; the marriage took place on Christmas Eve, 1508, when she was 14 years old. By her he had five children, the eldest son, Guidobaldo, being born in 1514. Francesco was twice driven out of his duchy. At one



time, supplanted by Lorenzo de' Medici with the help of Leo X, he went to Mantua, the seat of the Gonzaga family, whence he made vain efforts to recapture his possessions, but he was not reinstated until the death of both his enemies. According to Guicciardini, his inactivity contributed greatly to the fall of Rome in 1527, but

Rusticelli tells us that he was, by common consent, called the father and founder of the art of war as practised in the sixteenth century, and the opinion of the only dissentient, Guicciardini, a private enemy and no soldier, is amply balanced by that of Giovanni de' Medici, who ranked him in skilful tactics, and in the arts of command, as well as in foresight and activity, equal to the ablest generals and we are assured that after a public disputation in Padua, sustained by men of the greatest learning, he was voted a match to any hero of antiquity, in judgement, experience, ingenuity, and military talent <sup>1</sup>

According to Urbani, his private secretary

He was thoughtful, and his ideas and discourse tended to lofty themes. Ready of hand, he dexterously managed, on horseback or afoot, the arms then in use. Of high courage, he invariably bent his mind to objects conducive to his honour and renown, especially in war. He loathed incontinence and youthful excesses <sup>2</sup>

Similarly his biographer, G. Leoni, declared him to have been a great artilleryman as well as a cavalry leader, he loathed blasphemers and ravishers of women, imposing strict penalties on his soldiers for these offences; he was always most continent, very sparing in his dress and in food.<sup>3</sup>

In 1538 Francesco Maria was preparing to lead an army against Solyman, who had been menacing Venetian territory. Captain-General of the forces of the Republic, the Emperor, and the Pope, he intended to invade Turkish dominions, and to that end a fleet was being equipped. Having been in bad health for some time, however, he obtained leave of absence at the beginning of September, meaning to recuperate at his Villa dell' Imperiale at Pesaro, where he wished to inspect the work in progress under the supervision of his architect Girolamo Genga.

The Duke loved the arts as well as war. In his youth Castiglione had attended his court; Bembo was now one of his chief advisers. His villa, the gift of his wife, was decorated with great magnificence. One chamber, writes Vasari, had been entrusted to the brothers Dossi of Ferrara, but: 'The work was conducted in an absurd style and they departed from the Duke Francesco Maria's court in disgrace, and he was compelled to destroy all that they had executed, and cause the whole to be repainted with designs by Genga.' Their place was taken by Raffaello dal Colle. Titian also was under his patronage, he had painted a Christ, a Nativity,

<sup>1</sup> Dennistoun, *iii*, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> Cited by Dennistoun, *op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> G. Leoni, *Vista di F.M.* 1605, Venice, p. 459

and a Hannibal for the villa, and had recently, in 1537, executed portraits of the Duke and Duchess. More must be said of the Duke's portrait later.

Titian was asked to go to Pesaro to assist in the inspection. On September 6, however, the Duke suddenly fell so ill that he had to put off his journey, and, although he set sail with his family on the following day, he did not recover, but, after suffering greatly for six weeks, died on the night of October 20/21. Dressed in his armour, he was buried with great splendour at Urbino.

References by contemporary printed authorities to the manner of his death, and of its consequences, are unfortunately few and brief. Giovio, in his eulogy, declared that he met his end 'not by natural destiny, but through the malice of certain men, who, it is said, had him given poison, as can be seen from the certain evidence of a law-suit and of a confession by which it is plain that so vile a crime had been committed'. Leoni gave no further details. But if a full account 'writ in choice Italian' is not easily to be found to-day, a number of MS. references show that the affair was widely bruited both in and outside Italy. According to the chronicle of Girolamo Maria da Venezia, it was thought that he had been poisoned by his barber. Muratori's *Annali d'Italia* records under the year 1538 a manuscript according to which the murderer was Luigi Gonzaga, nicknamed Rhodomonte. This version was followed by later historians such as Sardi, Reposati, and Tondini. Dennistoun, however, pointed out that this Luigi Gonzaga (di Castiglione delle Stiviere) died before Francesco Maria (actually in 1532). He adds

Whoever may have been the author of the foul deed, it is agreed that the perpetrator was the Duke's Mantuan barber, who is generally said to have dropped a poisoned lotion into his ear. Baldi only mentions that he did it 'in a new way', and gives no account of the medical examination of the body which, he asserts, took place. In an old chronicle of Sinigaglia, Guidobaldo is stated to have had the barber torn in pieces with pincers and quartered in the streets of Pesaro.<sup>1</sup>

Fortunately, owing to the researches of Elisa Viani, whose monograph *L'Avvelenatura di F.M.* (Mantua, 1902) was based on an examination of letters, despatches, etc., in several archives, it is possible to give further particulars.

Immediately on Francesco Maria's death, his doctors, suspecting foul play, held a post-mortem which revealed traces of poison. The heir Guidobaldo at once arrested his father's barber, who confessed under torture that he had done the deed at the instigation of Luigi Gonzaga, Marchese di Castelfelfredo, and of Cesare Fregoso. Luigi Gonzaga was a relative of the Duchess Leonora, both he and Fregoso were known

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* III, p. 72.

enemies of the late Duke, he had fought for Leo X against the French before entering the service of the Emperor after the peace of 1529. Fregoso, originally in Venetian service, had shown himself so favourable to France that he had been banished from Venice, but during the past year, owing to pressure from the French King and the Emperor, he had been readmitted. The two were hand in glove, and Francesco Maria had protested (in 1533) against the Republic's electing them commander of cavalry and infantry respectively. He objected to Gonzaga especially, he wrote.

knowing the nature of Sig. Luigi, who is not only very malicious, but also very cunning in his conceits.

Neither Gonzaga nor Fregoso had been in Venice for some time. When informed of Guidobaldo's charge against them they indignantly denied its truth, Luigi in particular being vehement in his protestations and demands for justice. The following years were occupied with Guidobaldo's efforts to avenge his father and Gonzaga's efforts to obtain the protection of powerful backers.

When the new Duke started a legal process, Gonzaga got a doctor to declare that Francesco Maria had not died of poison, and appealed to the Pope, who ordered Guidobaldo to go to Rome. On the cancellation of this order, Gonzaga turned to the Emperor, and, when Guidobaldo countered this move by sending his own ambassador to Charles V, the support of France was sought by the alleged criminals, and, though Guidobaldo sent a messenger to the French court, he could not obtain an audience with the King, who was ill. After two years of this sort of thing, the Venetian Republic, moved probably by the lack of direct evidence and by the powerful support afforded to Guidobaldo's enemies, rejected his case against them, and offered him no satisfaction.

One of Gonzaga's letters in which he tried to show the impossibility of his having had any hand in the Duke's death throws light on the manner in which the murder was effected.

It does not seem probable to me (if it be true, as I have heard, that his late Excellency was sick of an infirmity considered grave before the barber arrived) that the Secretary would not have first wished to see the cessation of the sickness before placing himself in such danger. Nor can I imagine how in a grave sickness an opportunity can have occurred of bathing his ears many times (if the rumour be true which is spread abroad, that he had the chance to give him the poison many times through the ears) because, as it is said, in a grave and dangerous sickness it does not seem probable to bathe the ears much and often. And before his going to Venice this last time he had never done such a thing, nor could it therefore be thought that I might have been cognisant or an instigator of it, since I had not seen him for two years. Even though he was here twice during the past two years, that was during the time when I was with the Emperor's army.

Guidobaldo might remain unconvinced of Gonzaga's innocence, but temporal victory lay with the latter, as a characteristic effusion of Aretino suggests. The Scourge of Princes owed much to Francesco Maria, who had enabled him to return to Venice in 1538 after he had been driven out by a lawsuit. On hearing of the murder he delivered a violent attack on Gonzaga and Fregoso. Fearing the satire of the Censor of the World, they replied with meekness. It was not perhaps this, or a hope of gain, so much as a knowledge of the trend of the affair which made him climb down in a letter of March 31, 1540, in which he apologised for having connected the names of two such honourable gentlemen with the crime of a vile barber.

Confident of their security, the two honourable gentlemen now demanded 100,000 scudi damages for wrongful accusation. Guidobaldo (who had now settled the Camerino dispute) appealed to the Pope, who replied that he could have done nothing less than he had done 'for your own honour and the memory of your father'. Nothing came of the outrageous demand except an exchange of pamphlets, Leonardi, Guidobaldo's confidant, answering each of Gonzaga's manifestos on his master's behalf, while the auditor, Stefano Montanaro, offended by one of them, announced (1541) that he was willing to meet Gonzaga and defend his honour.

The next event of importance was the murder of Cesare Fregoso in 1541. Together with one Antonio Rincone, who was going to Constantinople to conclude a French alliance with Solyman, he left France for Venice on an ambassadorial mission. Crossing the Po, they were attacked by two boats laden with armed men, and disappeared. It was generally believed that they had been killed outright for the sake of their papers, and in Venice the Emperor was thought to have instigated the ambush.

Records, however, reveal that Fregoso was not killed at once, but taken prisoner by the Marchese del Vasto. That Guidobaldo knew this is proved by a letter in which he urged Vasto not to put Fregoso to death until he had told his secret. What happened then is unknown. Possibly Guidobaldo helped to plan the ambush, and the secret was the truth about the murder of his father.

The affair Gonzaga ended in 1543. Gonzaga was advised by one of his counsellors not to publish any further attacks on Guidobaldo until after the Duchess Leonora's return to Mantua, since she might act as a conciliating influence. She indeed wrote to Leonardi regretting the lengths to which matters had gone; but there is no other evidence as to her attitude. Gonzaga seems then to have dropped his claim against Urbino and to

have turned his malice against Leonardi, who, angered by a suggestion that *he* might have plotted the murder, challenged Luigi to a duel which appears never to have occurred

I have gone into this feud in so much detail, even at risk of obscuring the chief points at issue, because no account of it has hitherto been available in English. What parallels can be found between this story of Italian intrigue and counter-intrigue and the story of *Hamlet*? We may divide them according as they relate to the play within the play or to the story proper.

#### THE PLAY WITHIN THE PLAY

It may be well to begin by citing the relevant passages from Q1 and Q2.

Q1.

this play is

The image of a murder done in *guyana*, Albertus  
Was the Dukes name, his wife Baptista,  
Father, it is a knaush peece a worke. . .

Q2 this play is the Image of a murther doone in *Vienna*, *Gonzago* is the Dukes name, his wife *Baptista*, you shall see anon, 'tis a knaush peece of worke This is one *Lucianus*, Nephew to the King. . . A poysons him i'th Garden for his estate, his names *Gonzago*, the story is extant, and written in very choice Italian, you shall see anon how the murtherer gets the loue of *Gonzagoes* wife.

In the Dumbshow the characters, according to the reporter of Q1, are a 'King and Queene'; the murderer is Lucianus, 'nephew to the King', but the speech headings, a stage-direction, and the speech just quoted describe them as a 'Duke and Dutchesse'. In Q2 they are 'a King and Queene' both in the Dumbshow and in the text; yet there still remains a reference to the 'Duke'. These variants suggest that the original story on which *Hamlet* drew concerned a Duke and a Duchess; that the players dressed in royal robes and crowns in order to point the reference to Hamlet's father and Gertrude, and that the text was, in Q2 and F1, brought almost completely into accordance with this modification.

Hamlet's old play was called *The Murder of Gonzago*. Gonzago may have been the name of both victim and assassin. Francesco Maria's wife was a Gonzaga, and this name was better known in England than that of della Rovere. In any case the transference of a name affords no difficulty. The change would be all the more convenient if there were an old play based on the Pesaro murder in which intimate blood-relationship was given to the male characters in order that the villain might marry his victim's wife.

Lucianus, as Dowden pointed out, might well be a Latinised form of Luigi. This possibility is not removed by the fact that the Latin form of Luigi on the statue of Luigi Gonzaga di Castiglione at Sabbioneta is

Aloysius. What then of Albertus and Baptista? Albertus may be only a Q1 error; it is, however, worth noting that Francesco Maria's daughter Elisabetta married Alberico, Marchese di Massa. An earlier lord of Urbino, Federigo da Montefeltro (1444-82), had married Battista Sforza.

The victim in the play within the play dies 'in an Arbor' (Q1) 'upon an bank of flowers' (Q2), while old Hamlet was poisoned while 'sleeping in my orchard'. This is not unlike the case of Francesco Maria who died while resting from affairs of state at his beautiful villa in Pesaro, although he was probably poisoned more than once, and for the first time in Venice. Q1 *guyana* was probably an error. Did Shakespeare write *Venice*? Or did an intermediate author cloak the historical source of his material by setting the story in a different country but in a city with a similar name (Vienna)?

The Player Duke is elderly; in Q1 he has been married forty years (misreporting for thirty?); his blood runs weakly; age robs him of pleasure, and he does not expect to live much longer. In Q2 he has been married thirty years; his 'operant powers their functions leave to do'; while his wife says:

But woe is me, you are so sick of late,  
So far from cheer and from your former state,  
That I distrust you.

This reminds us of Francesco Maria's illness which led him to take leave of absence. The parallel is made more interesting by the fact that he and his Duchess had been married for thirty years in 1538.

The loving protestations of the Player Queen in Q2, her mourning for her husband's death (in the Dumbshow), and her reluctance to accept the poisoner's gifts, recall the well-known love of Leonora Gonzaga for her husband. From the day of their marriage they were passionately devoted to each other. According to Ugolino she made Raphael dal Colle paint the villa with representations of his victories at Ravenna, and placed in it an inscription: *Francesco Mariae Duci Metaurensium a bellis redeuntis Leonora uxor animi ejus causa villam exaedificavit*. Her love survived her hero, for she mourned him for the rest of her life, so the parallel goes no farther. If Hamlet's 'story' made her marry the murderer there was no historical foundation for it, though it is perhaps possible to see the germ of such a motif in the suggestion that she was regarded as a conciliatory influence between Gudobaldo and Gonzaga.

It is in the manner of the murder that the most obvious resemblance can be seen between the cases of Francesco Maria and *Hamlet*: 'Then enters Lucianus with poyson in a Viall, and powres it in his eares, and

goes away' (Q 1), 'Anon comes in an other man, takes off his crowne, kisses it, pours poyson in the sleepers eares, and leaves him' (Q 2). This method, which was regarded as 'a new way' even for late Renaissance Italy, certainly points to the Urbino murder as the original source.

#### THE HAMLET STORY.

The poisoning theme is the cardinal link between the play within the play and the Hamlet story proper. In asking Horatio's help during the forthcoming entertainment, Hamlet says:

There is a Play to night before the King,  
One Scene of it comes neere the Circumstance  
Which I haue told thee, of my Fathers death. (F1)

Previously, in I, v, his father has told how he was murdered by having poison poured into his ears. The Play-scene shows this act twice, once in Dumbshow, and again with speech. Obviously the manner of old Hamlet's death as well as that of the Player Duke was taken from the story 'writ in choice Italian'.

The Danish story does not mention poison, sleep or orchard. On the contrary, Belleforest expressly states that the deed was done by bloody violence in the banquet-hall of the palace, while Amleth's father sat at meat (Dover Wilson)

We may suggest with confidence therefore that, in adapting the saga for the Elizabethan stage, the original writer of the *Hamlet* tragedy used this important element of the 1538 murder. In one respect at least King Hamlet was identified with Francesco Maria della Rovere. But the play contains many other features not represented in the Danish or French source. We may well ask whether any of these have any resemblance to the story of the Duke of Urbino, since it would not be unnatural for the planner of *Hamlet*, using some elements of the Italian 'story' for his inset play, to use other elements of it in the play proper where he had to fill out or modify his main source.

Hamlet's father, like Francesco Maria, was a great warrior, having fought against the Norwegians and the Poles, winning great victories, he appeared in the guise of a commander to Hamlet and the soldiers. Compared with his murderer he was 'Hyperion to a satyr'. We gather that, unlike Claudius, he was no reveller, but chaste and serious in mind. (I cannot agree with Dover Wilson that Hamlet's regret at his having been slain while 'full of bread' means that he was a heavy eater. It means that he would have wished to die fasting, with body as well as mind prepared for Judgment.) Francesco Maria too was serious and chaste. Old Hamlet loved his wife so deeply that he would not have her tormented

in her sin. He, like Francesco Maria and the Player King, had been married about thirty years (v, 1). Most of these parallels are generic rather than particular, but there is one aspect of Hamlet's father for which we can find a striking counterpart. I refer to the portrait of him in III, iv, and to the descriptions of his personal appearance given elsewhere

The Hamlet saga supplied no hint for the portraits of the hero's father and uncle, yet the concrete illustration of the contrast between the two brothers is one of the most remarkable among the minor splendours of the play. I have mentioned the portrait of Francesco Maria painted by Titian in 1537. The relations of the painter with the Urbino family are described in detail by Crowe and Cavalcaselle, who treat this portrait as one of his finest works and show its renown in the sixteenth century by citing Aretino's praise of it in his letters and sonnets. I quote from their own description

We look at the large black eye, the hooked nose, and projecting jaw, with the perfect certainty that the owner of these features was a man of quick action and violent passions . . . we see him with the plumed helmet and emblems of his rank in the background of a semi-circular niche covered with red damasked velvet. The steel armour in which his muscular frame is encased stands out a marvel of cool bright polish in front of the niche, whilst his head is turned to the right, and relieved in light against the brown wall of a room. His martial aspect is enhanced by the firmness of his pose, the staff with his arms, which he holds with his right hand, and rests on his hip, and the batons with the tiara and keys and the motto 'Se sibi', which are clasped behind him.<sup>1</sup>

The picture is in the Uffizzi at Florence, a life-size figure at rather more than half-length. When one considers this portrait side by side with the descriptions of old Hamlet given in I, i, I, ii, and III, iv, one is struck by the resemblance. Here is the martial hero, with 'Hyperion's curls', and beard 'a sable silvered'; here is the armour which so impressed Horatio, here even is the field-marshal's 'truncheon'. It is not fantastic to surmise that 'the story writ in choice Italian' contained an illustration or a description of the Duke based upon Titian's portrait, and that details of this were assimilated into the Hamlet play.

If there be something of Francesco Maria in Hamlet's father, is there anything of Guidobaldo in Hamlet himself? Here we have little to go on. Both were avengers, and not very successful avengers. Guidobaldo was 24 years old in 1538; Hamlet according to Q1 was not more than that when his father died. Guidobaldo, like Hamlet, was rather a man of peace than a man of war, gentle in his youth though capable of action,

<sup>1</sup> Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *Titian*, I, pp. 412-13. The portraits of father, mother, and son, are in the 1909 edition of Dennistoun.



refined, and sensitive. These may well be coincidences. Yet for a moment I was startled out of scepticism when I glanced at a portrait by Titian thought to be of Guidobaldo. That pale thoughtful face with the lofty brow, that severely simple robe, its only ornament a gold chain round the shoulders, that fine hand holding a glove—so might Hamlet have looked. This seems too good to be true. But if the other parallels hold good it is quite possible that in the contemplative hero of the play, so unlike his Danish prototype, we have some faint vestige of that talented ex-student of the University of Padua who was described by his domestic tutor, G. P. Silvestro, as having 'the spirit of his father and of his grandfather Julius II, whilst his mild temper and sweet expression were those of his mother'.

Guidus Julhades, qui quamquam mitis et ore  
Blandus, ut ex vultu possis cognoscere matrem  
Patrem animis tamen et primis patrum exprimit annis <sup>1</sup>

*Hamlet* is marked by an unusual amount of subordinate political material for which no counterpart exists in Belleforest. Ambassadors go to Norway and return, Fortinbras wishes to attack Poland (much as Francesco Maria intended to attack Solymán) and seeks a safe conduct through Denmark. Hamlet and his two schoolfellows go on a mission to England. All this going and coming of messengers recalls, though dimly, the many missions which were a feature of the struggle between Gonzaga and Guidobaldo and of their efforts to implicate other countries in their affairs. In addition, France, the lurking-place of Cesare Fregoso, is also the temporary home of Laertes, whose return to Denmark is a danger to Hamlet much in the same way as the return to Venice of the Italian renegade must have seemed to Guidobaldo. The Q1 name Montano resembles that of Guidobaldo's dependent Montanaro. Such slight resemblances, if unsupported, would have little force. But there are other parallels. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern take Hamlet to England, ostensibly to demand tribute, actually to have him killed. Owing to his cunning they are held by the English King and put to death (v, ii, 382). Their fate is like that of the ambassadors Fregoso and Rincone who were taken by the Marchese del Vasto and slain with Guidobaldo's knowledge. Note too the part played by letters of commission in both stories; and finally the common feature of an attack by boat. The strange adventure of the pirate ship which attacked the vessel bearing Rosencrantz, Guildenstern and Hamlet to England has its counterpart in the boatloads of armed men who seized Fregoso.

<sup>1</sup> Dennistoun, III, p. 87.

Taken separately most of the above resemblances would seem remote or coincidental. Taken together they may not overwhelm by their congruity, but they suggest the possibility that other elements in *Hamlet* besides the play within the play may be ultimately derived from an account of the death of Francesco Maria and of his son's efforts to avenge him.

As to the immediate source used by the author of *Hamlet* we can only surmise. There are three possibilities. He may have drawn on an English play, *The Murder of Gonzago*, based on an Italian play or on a narrative; or he may have gone directly to an Italian play, or the narrative itself may have been the only source.

If there was an Italian dramatic source, it probably took one of two forms. It may have followed fairly closely the historical story, being written perhaps during the lifetime of Guidobaldo (d. 1574) as a compliment to him, attributing the death of Fregoso directly to his vengeance, and maybe ending with a duel in which the hero slew Gonzaga. Such a play might well have been written at Guidobaldo's court, for under him Urbino and Pesaro continued to be centres of culture, attracting such notabilities as Sperone, Trissino, Arètino, Bernardo Tasso, Mercantonio and Domenico Morosini, Dionigi Atanagi, Girolamo Muzio, and Corneho Lanci. A play of this kind could not cast doubts on the fidelity of the Duchess Leonora. Hence we should have to assume that the unfavourable treatment of the wife in *The Murder of Gonzago* was due either to the English author of that play if it ever existed, or to the author of *Hamlet*. That it was due to the author of *Hamlet* might seem to be suggested by Hamlet's intention of inserting 'some dozen or sixteen lines' into the script. In this case he must not only have introduced the seduction of the wife into the Dumbshow, but have written almost all the scene between her and her husband, since that is largely taken up with her protestations of eternal fidelity and his doubts as to her constancy.

On the other hand, the Italian play may merely have used several details from the story of Francesco Maria in a mainly fictitious plot containing an unfaithful widow, and this may have been used in an intermediate *Murder of Gonzago* or directly by the author of *Hamlet*.

Lastly there is the possibility that *Hamlet* drew directly upon a historical narrative of the events of 1538-43, but that these were manipulated with great freedom. Hamlet's 'The story is extant, writ in choice Italian' seems to point to this alternative. Certainly, by whatever process, the original story is completely transformed in the play as we have it from Shakespeare. In the assimilation of an Italian tale of thwarted revenge to

a Danish tale of revenge fulfilled, situations and relationships are changed, actions are attributed to different agents, incidents are modified to give greater dramatic intensity, so that it is mainly by an accumulation of minor similarities that we can trace what may be the germ of some hitherto inexplicable features in the tragedy.

G. BULLOUGH.

SHEFFIELD.

## THE RESTORATION STAGE IN NEWSPAPERS AND JOURNAL, 1660—1700

THE Burney Collection of newspapers in the British Museum provides some interesting material for the student of the Restoration stage. I have therefore thought it well worth while to examine the newspapers from 1660 to 1700, supplement them from the Bodleian collections and to extract from both sources items of theatrical and dramatic interest. These items fall into two main categories, one taken from the news section of the paper and consisting of descriptions of special performances, of happenings in the playhouses, and of biographical details about the players, the other, taken from the advertisements and chiefly concerned with the publication of plays. With the latter section I hope to deal in another article. It is mainly upon the news items that I wish to concentrate here. I have, however, included a few advertisements when these are not notices of publication, as, for instance, the announcements of the masters of the revels, or the opening extract advertising that the Fortune Theatre was for sale, which so appropriately symbolises the passing of an old order.

The entries are divided into two parts for convenience of reference. In the first are included all matters affecting performances or the theatres themselves, in the second items concerning personalities connected with the theatre. The former is by far the longer and the more important. Many royal and ambassadorial visits to the theatre are therein chronicled. It seems indeed to have been a common practice to regale ambassadors and other distinguished guests with theatrical entertainments. Their presence and that of their retinue in strange costume must have given a picturesque touch to an already lively scene. It is of interest to notice the plays that were chosen for these occasions: opera with its lavish scenes was an easy favourite, probably because it was considered our highest attainment in elaborate display and scenic contrivance, and might, on that account, be relied upon to impress the visitors from far lands.

The amazing popularity of foreign singers and dancers, and the excitement caused by the immense salaries paid them in the last years of the century, are once again evidenced from these sources. Several references to the strong man's performance show how much he was a centre of interest. It is instructive to note that whilst William III encouraged both dancer and strong man by having command performances at Kensington, we do not once hear of his visiting the theatre. Royal patronage of the drama was left to Princess Anne.

As a last section I have taken material of theatrical interest from *The Gentleman's Journal By way of Letter to a Gentleman in the Country. Consisting of news, history, philosophy, poetry, musick, translations, etc.* This was a monthly (occasionally a bi-monthly) periodical written by Peter Motteux and published from January 1691/2 until October/November 1694. There generally followed upon the book section, called 'news of learning', a paragraph or two about the latest plays either in publication or performance. Mr Montague Summers has already utilised some of the material in his editions of the Restoration dramatists, but the greater part of it has not been reprinted. I have therefore quoted nearly always in full, omitting only sentences of little interest or passages easily accessible in Mr Summers' editions. The quotations are lengthy but in précis their flavour evaporates, and the sense of excitement, with which a new work by a well-known author was anticipated, is lost

The paragraphs are of particular interest both as dating productions and as contemporary records of the popularity of plays during those years. With regard to the dating, however, it should be borne in mind that the *Gentleman's Journal* was sometimes published a good deal later than the month it represented on the title-page. The *London Gazette* for April 24–27, for instance, advertises that 'On Saturday next, the 29th Instant, will be published the Gentleman's Journal—This for March 1693'

During the period covered the two dramatic companies were united and all plays were acted at Drury Lane, unless they were spectacular enough to require the resources of Dorset Garden. Only a month after the *Gentleman's Journal* had ceased publication, Betterton lodged with the Lord Chamberlain the complaint which was finally to lead to his secession in 1695. Of the quarrelling which must have been going on behind the scenes we hear nothing, nor indeed is the acting hardly ever mentioned. Motteux concentrates attention on the plays themselves. When he makes a criticism it is always in praise; yet his remarks are illuminating as indicating the qualities for which the plays of the time were admired.

### I. SPECIAL PERFORMANCES AND PLAYHOUSE NEWS.

*Mercurius Publicus*, Feb 14–21, 1661.

The Fortune Play-house,<sup>1</sup> situate between Whitecross-street and Gouling lane, in the Parish of St Giles Cripple-gate, with the Ground thereto belonging, is to be Let to build upon, where 23 Tenements may be erected, with Gardens; and a Street may be cut through, for the better accommodation of the Building.

Inquire of Mr Jenkins a Scrivener in Black-Friers.

<sup>1</sup> It had been dismantled by the Puritans in 1649. See Leslie Hotson, *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, 1928 p. 43.

See also Kingdom's *Intelligencer*, March 11-18.

*True News*, Feb. 4-7, 1679/80.

On Munday night last happened a great disorder in the Duke's Play-house,<sup>1</sup> some Gentlemen in their Cupps entring into the Pitt, flinging Links at the Actors, and using several reproachful speeches against the Dutchess of P[ortsmouth] and other persons of Honour, which has occasioned a Prohibition from farther Acting, till his Majesties farther pleasure.<sup>2</sup>

*True Domestick Intelligence*, May 11-14, 1680.

And about an hour after, came their Royal Highnesses also accompanied with many Gentry; and after dinner they went to the Dukes Play-house: and as soon as the Play was ended, they returned back to Windsor.

*True Protestant Mercury*, March 19-23, 1680/1.

Oxford Sunday the 20. Yesterday in the afternoon His Majesty, accompanied with the Duke of Grafton, Albemarle, and Earl of Feversham, in his coach returned from Burford, the same afternoon H M. was pleased to be present at the first Play here, being Tamerlane the Great, where also was the Dutchess of Portsmouth and Madam Gunn

*Loyal Protestant*, Saturday, Aug 13, 1681.

From Dublin we hear, That a Play was lately acted there, which lively described a Subborner, and Malice against Innocence. But, as a guilty Conscience always discovers it self, it happened that one of the Spectators, better acquainted with levelling a Ditch than with Poets Fancies, seeing himself thus drawn to the life, tho' not intended by the Poet, began to sweat and blush, and all in a rage he went to the Lord Lieutenant, and complained that the Actors had abused him, and the Play was made purposely to expose him to the world

*Impartial Protestant Mercury*, Friday, Jan 20-Tuesday, Jan. 24, 1681/2

The Morocco Ambassador, on Thursday last, went to the Dukes Theatre, where was Acted *Psyche*,<sup>3</sup> a Play of extraordinary splendor, with which his Excellency was extremely pleas'd

*Loyal Protestant*, Feb. 2, 1681/2.

This day [Feb 1st] his Excellency the Ambassador of Morocco was present at the Dukes Theatre, where the *Tempest*<sup>4</sup> was acted with which his Excellency seem'd extremely pleased.

*Loyal Protestant*, Saturday, Feb. 18, 1681/2.

On the 16th instant his Excellency the Morocco Embassador was pleased to divert himself at his R. Highness's Theatre, where to the satisfaction of his Excellency, was acted the Tragedy of *Mackbeth*.<sup>5</sup>

*Loyal Protestant*, Feb. 23, 1681/2.

This evening His Majesty was pleased to divert himself at a Comedy at the Theatre Royal

*True Protestant Mercury*, Feb 25-March 1, 1681/2.

Yesterday the Morocco Embassador diverted himself at a Comedy at the Royal Theater, and tomorrow, we hear his Majesty is to be there to see the *Mock Tempest*.

*Impartial Protestant Mercury*, April 28-May 2, 1682.

London May 1. The same afternoon [April 27] Mr Ch. D [eering] son to Sir Edw. D [eering] and Mr V [aughan] quarrell'd in the Dukes Play-house and presently

<sup>1</sup> Dorset Garden.

<sup>3</sup> Shadwell's opera.

<sup>5</sup> Probably in Davenant's operative version.

<sup>2</sup> See Montague Summers, *The Restoration Theatre*, 1934, p 80.

<sup>4</sup> Shadwell's opera.

mounted the stage and fought, and Mr D was very dangerously wounded, and Mr V secured lest it should prove Mortal

In this paper there is also a long passage concerning Martin Powell the actor, who is reported to have been arrested for threatening one Prance and making him drink to the Duke of York.

*Loyal Protestant*, May 18, 1682

Salisbury—Court<sup>1</sup> May 17 This day his Excellency the Ambassador from the Great King of Bantam came to our Theatre, to divert himself at a Play, attended by a numerous Train of his own Servants, who (as a Guard to his Person) preceded his Coach, arm'd with Jav'lins and Lances, some of them bearing up 2 Umbrellas of State

*Loyal Protestant*, May 20, 1682, *True Protestant Mercury*, May 17-20

May 18. Yesterday His Excellency the Morocco Ambassador was entertain'd at His Royal Highness's Theatre with a Play called, Sir Timothy Treat all,<sup>2</sup> and this day the Bantam Ambassador with The Libertine destroy'd<sup>3</sup>

*True Protestant Mercury*, Aug. 12-16, 1682.

Thursday last being Acted a Play called the Tragedy of Romulus<sup>4</sup> at the Dukes Theatre, and the Epilogue spoken by the Lady Slingsbey and written by Mrs Behn which reflected on the D of Monmouth the Lord Chamberlain has ordered them both in custody to answer that affront for the same

*True Protestant Mercury*, Oct. 17, 1682.

Newmarket His Majesty every morning recreates Himself upon the Heath, and in the evening (after Horse racing) to see a Play acted by His Majesty's Servants

*Post Boy*, June 20, 1695

I am informed that the Lord Chamberlain hath been pleased to displace Mr Pate and Mr Reading from their places in the Play-House for being in the late Riot in Drury Lane.<sup>5</sup>

*Post Boy*, Friday, June 21, 1695

On Wednesday morning the Old Play-house in Dorset Garden was robbed of some of the Actors Cloaths to the value of 300l

*Post Boy*, June 22-25, 1695.

On Saturday last Words arose betwixt Mr Cary and Mr Young in the Play-house about a Gentlewoman, and the next morning they fought a Duel in Hide-Park, where they were both Wounded; the Former died in the Evening, at the Star Inn in the Strand.<sup>6</sup>

*Intelligence Domestick and Foreign*, June 25-28, 1695

Mr Young, who the last week, Killed Mr Carey about a Woman at the Playhouse, after much regret for being guilty of such an heinous Crime in so ill a Cause, is since likewise dead.

*Post Man*, April 28-30, 1696

The Venetian Ambassadors went yesterday to see a Play called the Indian Queen,<sup>7</sup> accompanied by about 30 persons in 6 Coaches.

<sup>1</sup> Dorset Garden.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs Behn's *The City Heiress*. or *Sir Timothy Treat-all*

<sup>3</sup> Shadwell's *The Libertine* was also known as *Don John*. or *The Libertine Destroyed*

<sup>4</sup> *Romulus and Hersilia*. or, *The Sabine War*

<sup>5</sup> For account of Jacobite riot see Luttrell, *Relation of State Affairs* 1857, III, pp 484, 487

<sup>6</sup> See Montague Summers, *op. cit.*, p. 80

<sup>7</sup> Sir Robert Howard and Dryden's *Indian Queen* had been made into an opera by Purcell. See Dryden, *The Dramatic Works*, ed. M. Summers, I, p. 205.

*Post Boy*, Tuesday, Feb 2–Thursday, Feb 4, 1697.

On Monday the King visited the Princess of Denmark and invited her to White-hall on Saturday next, it being her Royal Highnesses Birth Day, and his Majesty has been pleased to give the Right Honourable the Lord Chamberlaine Orders to have the Play called *Love for Love*, written by Mr Congreve, Acted there the better to Celebrate the Day

*Post Boy*, June 12–15, 1697

Great Preparations are making for a new OPERA in the Play-house in Dorset-Garden, of which there is great Expectation, the Scenes being several new Sets and of a model different from all that have been used in any Theatre whatever, being twice as high as any of their former Scenes<sup>1</sup> And the whole Decoration of the Stage not only infinitely beyond all the Opera's ever yet performed in England, but also by the acknowledgment of several Gentlemen that have Travell'd abroad, much exceeding all that has been seen on any of the Foreign Stages

*Post Boy*, June 29–July 1, 1697

The New Opera will be Acted this day for the benefit of the Undertaker

*Post Boy*, Oct 30–Nov. 2, 1697

There was Yesterday a very great Feast in the Temple, there being present the Right Honourable the Lord Chancellor, with Divers of the Judges, after Dinner there was a Play<sup>2</sup> Acted, and at night Dancing.

*Post Boy*, Dec 16–18, 1697.

We hear that the Marquiss of Carmarthen who lately Entertain'd the Great Officer from the CZAR of Muscovy, at the Opera call'd the Prophetess,<sup>3</sup> has this day Bespoke the Entertainment of the Indian Queen<sup>4</sup> at the Theatre Royal.

*Post Boy*, Jan 13–15, 1697/8.

'Tis said that this day will be Acted, at the Theatre in Dorset Garden, the Opera, called Prophetess on [or] Dioclesian, at the request of a Nobleman, they will not tell us who, but we presume for the Entertainment of a very great Foreigner<sup>5</sup>

*Post Boy*, Jan 15–18, 1697/8

'Tis said that the Czar of Muscovy, was at the Playhouse on Saturday, to see the Opera

*Post Man*, Feb 24–26, 1697/8

London Feb. 26 On Thursday the Czar of Muscovy came privately with a small Retinue to Kensington, and I am told went afterwards to see the Play, the Rival Queens, or the Death of Alexander the Great.

*Protestant Mercury*, March 23–25, 1698

On Tuesday, His Excellency the French Ambassador was incognito at the Play-House in Drury Lane

*Post Boy*, Saturday, May 14–Tuesday, May 17, 1698

London May 17 On Friday night last there was fine Dancing at Kensington, where His Majesty was present, as also his Excellency the French Ambassador: The French-

<sup>1</sup> Settle's *The World in the Moon* 'The last set of scenes terminates at 50 feet deep, being the extent of the house' Genest, *History of the Stage*, III, p 101

<sup>2</sup> *Love for Love* See *A Calendar of the Inner Temple Records*, ed F A Inderwick, III, p. 337 The players from L I F received £20 for the performance

<sup>3</sup> An adaptation as an opera of Beaumont and Fletcher's play, by Betterton

<sup>4</sup> See p 448, note 7

<sup>5</sup> This appears to be the earliest announcement of a forthcoming performance at a public playhouse.



## 450 *Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660–1700*

man, who is lately come over, and Dances now at the Play-house, was sent for to dance there, and performed his part very dexterously<sup>1</sup>

This Day will be Acted the last new Tragedy, call'd PHAETON, or the Fatal Divorce<sup>2</sup> For the Benefit of the Author, and for the Entertainment of several French Persons of Quality

*Post Boy*, May 31–June 2, 1698

London June 2nd This Day, at the Theatre in Drury-Lane, will be Acted a Play, called, The Plain-Dealer, upon a very charitable Account, the Profits of the Play being given for the Release of a distressed Gentleman from Prison And the chief Part is acted by Capt Griffin,<sup>3</sup> formerly a famous Actor, and lately Captain of a Company of Foot in His Majesty's Service, through the Wars in Ireland

*Post Boy*, July 2–5, 1698

This Day is Acted the TEMPEST, at the Kings Playhouse in Drury-Lane, for the Entertainment of a Foreign Prince, who, we are positively inform'd, is the Prince of Parma in Person

*Post Boy*, July 7–9, 1698.

This day is acted OROONOKO, at the King's Playhouse, for the particular Entertainment of some Persons of the highest Quality, with the Italian Shades, as they were perform'd with great Applause, before their Excellencies the Russian and Morocco Ambassadors, in the Reign of King Charles II. And an Entertainment after the manner of the Carnaval at Rome With several Grotesque Dances

*Flying Post*, Feb 21–23, 1698/9

The famous Italian, Signior Fideh, is to Sing next Tuesday at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane; both in Italian and English, which he never yet performed.<sup>4</sup>

*Dawks' News Letter*, Feb 23, 1698/9.

Her Royal Highness the Princess of Denmark, diverted herself at the Theatre in Lincolns-Inn-Fields on Tuesday night [Feb. 21.]

*Protestant Mercury*, March 8–10, 1698/9

Last Tuesday Night, 2 Men Quarrelling at the Playhouse about a Mistress, went out and Fought, and one of them was Wounded.

*Post Man*, April 4–6, 1699.

On Easter Monday, at the New Theatre in Little Lincolns Inn Fields will be an entertainment of Dancing, performed by Monsieur Balon<sup>5</sup> newly arrived from Paris.

<sup>1</sup> *The Dancing Master* 10th edition 'Also to the 2nd part is added a new Entry and Saraband Danc'd by Monsieur Labbee, at the Theater in Lincolns-Inn-Fields Also before the King at Kensington, with great Applause.' *Post Boy*, June 2–4, 1698

<sup>2</sup> By Charles Gildon

<sup>3</sup> 'One Mrs Griffin, Wife to Capt Griffin, who is at St. Germain's with the late King James, is taken into Custody here, she having lately come over from France without a pass', *Post Boy*, June 2–4, 1698.

<sup>4</sup> Cf Haynes' epilogue to Farquhar's *Love and a Bottle*, 1699.

'An Italian now we've got of mighty Fame,  
Don Sigismondo Fideh—There's Musick in his Name,  
His voice is like the Musick of the Spheres  
It shoud' be Heavenly for the Price it bears.

[20l. a time

He's a handsome fellow too, looks brisk and trim  
If he don't take ye, Then the Devil take him'

<sup>5</sup> Mentioned by Downes as one of the dancers and singers brought by Betterton from abroad to gratify the desires and fancies of the nobility and gentry. *Roscius Anglicanus*, 1708, p. 40

'Twas otherwise lately with Balon, the Town ran mad to see him, and the prizes were rais'd to an extravagant degree to bear the extravagant rate they allow'd him.' Gildon, *A Comparison Between the Two Stages*, 1702, p. 49.

*Post Boy*, April 13-15, 1699.

As both the Theatres have been very industrious to Entertain the Town with several eminent Masters in Singing and Dancing, lately arrived, both from France and Italy, as Monsieur Balon, Signior Fideh &c we are now assured that the Masters of the Theatre Royal have engag'd Signior Clementina,<sup>1</sup> the famous Eunuch, Servant to the Elector of Bavaria, to Sing on their publick Stage, for the short time of his stay in England There is very great Expectation from his Performance as being a Person of that extraordinary Desert in Singing, that his yearly Salary on that Account is 500*l* a Year

*Post Boy*, April 27-29, 1699.

Her Royal Highness is this day pleased to see the Opera, call'd The Island Princess.<sup>2</sup> Performed at the Theatre Royal by her own Command

*Post Boy*, Saturday, May 13-Tuesday, May 16, 1699. See also *Dawks' News Letter*, May 16

Her Royal Highness the Princess Ann of Denmark diverted herself on Saturday last at the Theatre in Little Lincolns-Inn-Fields

*Post Man*, Nov 25-28, 1699

The Strong man who has made so much noise in Town, and who performed several things before the King with extraordinary strength,<sup>3</sup> showed many feats on Saturday at Dorset Garden, but there is another Sampson come out of Derbyshire, who pretends to out do the Kentish.

*London Post*, Dec 4-6, 1699.

At the Request of several Persons of Quality, on Thursday next, being the 7th Inst at the Theatre in Dorset Garden, the Famous Kentishmen, Wm. & Rich. Joy, design to show to the Town before they leave it, the same Tryals of Strength both of them, that Wm. had the Honour of showing before His Majesty, and their Royal Highnesses, with several other Persons of Quality, for which, hereceiv'd a considerable Gratuity . . . Beginning exactly at 2, and Ending at 4. The Boxes 4*s*. the Pit 2*s*. 6*d*. 1st Gallery 2*s*. upper Gall 1*s*

The *London Post* for Dec. 6-8 adds that £100 reward is offered to any one who can perform similar feats of strength, 'Several scandalous Persons' having averred that they could. The penalty for failure in the attempt was £20

## II. BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS.

### (a) *Masters of the Revels.*

*London Gazette*, May 1-5, 1673, and May 8-12

The Office of Master of the Revels, void by the death of Sir Henry Herbert (who deceased the 27 of April last) is now injoyed by Thomas Killigrew Esq, one of the Grooms of His Majesties Bedchamber, at whose Lodgings in Whitehall, any Person or Persons may be informed, whether those who had any Licenses from the said Sir Henry, or are otherwise concerned in the said Office of Master of the Revels, may make their applications for renewing of former, or taking out of new Lycenses, or what else relates unto the said Office.

*London Gazette*, May 15-16, 1673, and May 26-29.

That all Justices of the Peace and others His Majesties Officers, whom it may concern, do take care that all Persons that present publicly any Playes, Shows, or

<sup>1</sup> 'But above all commend me to Signior Clementi—he got more by being an Eunuch than if he had the best Back in Christendom' Gildon, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Motteux's opera had been produced about two months previously.

<sup>3</sup> For a description of the performance given at Kensington, see *Flying Post*, Nov. 14-16.

## 452 *Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660–1700*

Operations upon any Stage, &c may produce their Licence under the Hand and Seal of Thomas Killegrew Esquire, now Master of the Revels, and in case they want such Licences, that they be laid hold on, and the said Mr Killegrew, certified of the same

*London Gazette*, Feb. 1–5, 1676/7

These are to give Notice to all Persons exposing publickly any Shows, Motions, Stage-Players, or strange Sights... and all others who usually have been Licenced by the Master of the Revels for the time being, that for the future they are to have their Licences from Charles Killegrew Esq, now Master of the Revels, or upon expiration of their former Licences, to renew them at his Office at Whitehall All Licences granted for the future, will be Printed, to prevent the Abuses that has [sic] been committed by several Persons <sup>1</sup>

*London Gazette*, Aug 26–30, 1686.

These are to give Notice to all Stage-Players, Mountebanks, Rope-Dancers, and others, shewing strange Sights and Motions, whose Licences are Expired, or have None, That they forthwith repair to Charles Killigrew Esq, Master of the Revels, at his Office in Somerset-house, to take out Licences, Or otherwise, they will be proceeded against for the same.

### (b) *Nell Gwynn.*

*London Gazette*, Dec 29–Jan 1, 1679

Madam Guin having on the 28th of December last, lost a Diamond Button of considerable value, If any can give notice thereof to herself at her house in the Pall-mall they shall be well rewarded for their pains.

*Domestick Intelligence*, Tuesday, Aug. 5, 1679. See also *English Intelligencer*, Aug. 2, 1679.

We hear that Madam Ellen Gwins Mother sitting lately neer the waterside, at her House by the Neat Houses near Chelsey, fell accidentally into the water and was drowned <sup>2</sup> As also that Madam Gwins youngest Son is lately dead <sup>3</sup>

*Mercurius Domesticus*, Friday, Dec. 19, 1679 See also *Domestick Intelligence*, *ibid.*

Several false and ridiculous Reports being spread abroad concerning Madam Ellin Guyn, as to her death, or absence from her house, we are assured that there is no ground for such a Report, the said Madam Ellin Gwyn being now at her own house in health, and has not been absent from it.

*Mercurius Anglicus*, Dec 13–17, 1679.

The Report of Madam Gwys being lost... is false.

*Smith's Protestant Intelligence*, March 17–21, 1680/1.

The Dutchess of Portsmouths Coach broke at Wickham, and there she stayed at the George until they got a new Axeltree Madam Gwyn was very liberal to the Ringers and Poor all the Road, and especially at Beconfield and Wickham, where she distributed much Money.

### (c) *Miscellaneous.*

*Flying Post*, Dec 26–28, 1695.

Mr William Smith, a Gentleman, belonging to the Theatre Royal, who had acquired a considerable Estate, and thereupon desisted from Acting, was prevailed upon by the New Play house to remount the Stage; but upon shifting his cloathes in the last New Play, took cold and died thereof this week

<sup>1</sup> See Leslie Hotson, *op. cit.*, p 261.

<sup>2</sup> Cf A à Wood, *Life and Times*, *Oxford Historical Society*, II, p. 457 July 20 1679 'Elen Gwynn, commonly called old Madam Gwynne, being drunk with brandy, fell in a ditch neare the Neat houses, London, and was stifled Mother to Nell Quin'

<sup>3</sup> This was not true. James Beaucherk died in Paris, Sept 1680.

*Protestant Mercury*, May 18–20, 1696 See also *London News-Letter*, May 18–20

Some Players Drinking on Monday Night at the Barr in the Rose Tavern in Covent Garden, made some Noise, which offending some Gentlemen that were in an adjacent Room, one of them lookt out and spoke some words, which the Players retorting, a Quarrel ensu'd and several Swords were drawn, and Mr Horden<sup>1</sup> the Player was killed in the Scuffle, in which the Gentlemen fled, but Capt Burgis, who was lately Tried for Killing Mr Fane,<sup>2</sup> being of the Company, was taken and Committed, and yesterday the Coroners Inquest sate upon the Body, but had not given in their Verdict last Night.

*Post Boy*, Oct 15–17, 1696.

On Tuesday Mr Pits was Tried at the Old Baily, for being in company when Hording the Player was killed, and was Acquitted

*Post Man*, Saturday, May 23–26, describes how Capt. Burgess, then a prisoner in the gatehouse for the murder of Horden, made his keeper drunk, was rescued from him by ten sparks and so escaped. He was finally pardoned by the King (Luttrell, iv, p 312 )

*Protestant Mercury*, Sept 7–9, 1696

Last night dyed Mr. Noaks, the famous Comedian, some miles out of Town, and 'tis said, has left a considerable Estate, tho' he has not frequented the Play-house constantly for some years.<sup>3</sup>

*Flying Post*, Thursday, May 19–21, 1698.

On Wednesday Night last, one Mr Davenant, formerly belonging to the Play-House in Covent Garden, being late abroad, upon his return home to his House in the end of Grays-Inn-Lane next the Fields, heard some noise in his Yard, and opening his back Door, three Fellows, whom he believed to be Dutchmen by their Speech, having got over the Yard Wall, came up to him with drawn Swords, against whom he made a defence, but one of them run his Sword into his Right side, and he crying Murder, the People of the House came running down Stairs, about Two a Clock in the Morning, and two Dutchmen being discovered in or near Red-Lion-Fields a little after, were seized on suspicion, and next Morning being had before a Justice were committed to Newgate.

*Flying Post*, Saturday, May 21–24, 1698

The corps of Mr Davenant, who was murdered in his House in Grays Inn Lane, was honourably interr'd on Sunday night last under St Brides Church in Fleetstreet.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Luttrell, *op cit*, iv, pp 61, 63, 126 Hildebrand Horden. 'Auther of a Play, call'd Neglected Virtue, or The Unhappy Conqueror, a Tragedy He was an Actor of considerable Note, but was killed about the seventh Year of his Appearance', Giles Jacob, *Poetical Register*, 1719, i, p. 291 Prof Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama*, 1928, p 364, gives this play to Charles Hopkins In the dedication to Hon Sir John Smith Bt. Horden speaks of its ill success and declares that it is none of his own upon which statement Gildon, *Lives of the English Dramatick Poets*, 1698, p 165 comments 'and in that he's much in the Right, for all the Comical Part is taken out of Fletcher' The play was acted at D L. 1696

<sup>2</sup> For a report of his duel with Fane, see *Post Man*, April 11–14, 1696, and for his subsequent sentence, *Post Man*, April 23–25

<sup>3</sup> According to Colley Cibber Nokes died 'about the same year' as Mountfort and Leigh, i.e. 1692 The *D N B*. gives this date with a question mark. He probably died at Totteridge where he had an estate.

<sup>4</sup> The Rev A Taylor, Vicar of St Brides, kindly writes in answer to my enquiry that the name in the register is Ralph Davenant. He was a son of Sir William Davenant and became Treasurer of the United Companies 1684. See Luttrell, *op. cit*, iv, p 382.

III. *THE GENTLEMAN'S JOURNAL*

Jan 1691/2, p 5

'Now I speak of Music I must tell you that we shall have speedily a New Opera<sup>1</sup> wherein something very surprising is promised us, Mr Purcel who joyns to the Delicacy and Beauty of the Italian way, the Graces and Gayety of the French, composes the Music as he hath done for the Prophetess, and the last Opera called King Arthur,<sup>2</sup> which hath been plaid several times the last Month Other Nations bestow the name of Opera only on such Plays whereof every word is sung But experience hath taught us that our English genius will not relish that perpetual Singing . . . But our English Gentlemen, when their Ear is satisfy'd, are desirous to have their mind pleas'd, and Music and Dancing industriously intermix'd with Comedy or Tragedy. I have often observed that the Audience is no less attentive to some extraordinary Scenes of passion or mirth, than to what they call Beaux Endroits, or the most ravishing part of the Musical Performance. . . But this shows that what is unnatural, as are Plays altogether sung, will soon make one uneasy, which Comedy or Tragedy can never do unless they be bad'

The article continues with a description of operas in Venice

'They have little or no Machines there; their Decorations and Cloaths are but mean, and their Stages but ill Illuminated, but their Music makes amends for the rest. Yet tho strangers cannot but admire it, they find as Mr Dryden ingeniously observes upon another subject, that it is not pleasant to be tickled too long, and wish for the conclusion usually before the Opera be half done'

We have had a new Comedy this last Month, call'd The Wives Excuse: Or, Cuckolds make themselves It was written by Mr Southern, who made that call'd Sir Anthony Love, which you and all the Town have lik'd so well I will send you the Wives Excuse, as soon as it come out in Print, which will be very speedily. And tho' the Town hath not been so kind to this last, as to the former,<sup>3</sup> I do not doubt but you will own that it will bear a Reading, which some that meet with a better Fate too often do not, some that must be granted to be good Judges, commend the purity of its language.<sup>4</sup> The Indian Emperor<sup>5</sup> hath been reviv'd and play'd many times, and we are to have very suddenly a Tragedy and a Comedy You have often ask'd me, who was the Author of that, call'd the Gordian Knot unt'y'd,<sup>6</sup> and wondered, with many more, why it was never printed I hear that Gentleman who writ lately a most ingenious Dialogue concerning Women, now translated into French, is the Author of that witty Play, and it is almost a Sin in him to keep It and his Name from the World

The Merry Wives of Windsor, an old Play, hath been reviv'd, and was play'd the last day of the year

Feb 1692, Licensed Feb 12, p 26.

I send you the Marriage-hater match'd, a new Comedy by Mr Durfey,<sup>7</sup> it hath met with very good success, having been plaid six days together, and is a diverting Play

<sup>1</sup> *The Fairy Queen*, see *post*, p 456.

<sup>2</sup> Dryden's *King Arthur*, D G late May 1691. See Dryden, *The Dramatic Works*, ed. M. Summers, 1931, vi, p 234 *London Gazette* advertises it June 4-8, 1691, as 'performed'

<sup>3</sup> Jacob says of Sir Anthony Love 'Thus play was acted with great applause.' *Poetical Register*, i, p 246

<sup>4</sup> Jacob, *op. cit.*, i, p 246, remarks on it.

<sup>5</sup> M. Summers (*Dryden*, i, p 252) notes this revival.

<sup>6</sup> An unprinted play not mentioned by Genest or Nicoll. *The Stage Cyclopaedia*, 1909, queries its being acted in 1691

<sup>7</sup> Gildon in a letter prefixed to the play, 1692, says that the throng of spectators on the stage and the efforts of an opposite faction 'must needs have damn'd it, had it not by the Force and Vigour of its own Worth rais'd itself the second day with the general Applause of all that saw it'.

Mr Dryden has compleated a new Tragedy, intended shortly for the Stage, wherein he hath done a great unfortunate Spartan no less justice than Roman Anthony met with in his *All for Love*. Mr Dryden makes his Spartans, in this, speak as manly Heroic Lacedaemonians these more than Romans ought to speak, and since I am certain of your assent, at least, to my Faith, I shall be bold to add, That though I cannot but grant that Cleomenes alone could be Author of his own glorious Performances, yet I am most confident that their intire Lustre will be fully maintained by Mr Dryden's Lively Descriptions, and Mr Batterton's Natural Imitation.<sup>1</sup>

March 1691/2, Licensed March 9, p. 9.

We have had lately a new Play, called, *The Innocent Impostors*. It hath been acted four times, Mr Shadwell Poet-Laureat, usher'd it in to the Stage. It is said that the Author of it is not one of the Laity,<sup>2</sup> therefore since he desires not to be known, I shall not presume to let you know his Name, tho the Play being Historical, and altogether of the Tragick kind, and withal treated with all the decency imaginable, can never be inglorious to its ingenious Author.

The History of Caius Marius<sup>3</sup> is to be revived on Wednesday next, and after Easter we are to have a New Opera, and Mr Dryden's Cleomenes very shortly.

April 1692, Licensed April 13, p. 21

The Traytor,<sup>4</sup> an old Tragedy, hath not only been reviv'd the last Month, but also been reprinted with Alterations and Amendments. It was suppos'd to be Shirly's, but he only usher'd it on to the Stage, the Authour of it was one Mr Rivers a Jesuit, who wrote it in his Confinement in Newgate, where he died. It hath always been esteemed a very good Play, by the best Judges of Dramatic Writing.

Mr Banks hath writ a Tragedy call'd the Innocent Usurper, wherein I am told, that he hath treated the History of the Lady Jane Grey, with the same success as that of Queen Anne Boulen in his *Virtue Betray'd*, and that of the Earl of Essex in his *Unhappy Favorite*. However, there being some reasons which hinder it from appearing on the Stage, he designs to submit it to the Judgment of every Impartial Reader, and it will speedily appear in print.<sup>5</sup>

I was in hopes to have given you in this Letter an account of the Acting of Mr Dryden's Cleomenes; It was to have appear'd upon the Stage on Saturday last, and you need not doubt but that the Town was big with Expectation of the performance, but Orders came from her Majesty to hinder its being Acted, so that none can tell when it shall be play'd. The Opera whereof I wrote to you, will be hasten'd upon this account.

May 1692, Licensed May 14, p. 17.

I told you in my last, that none could then tell when Mr Dryden's Cleomenes<sup>6</sup> would appear; since that time, the Innocence and Merit of the Play have rais'd it several eminent Advocates, who have prevail'd to have it Acted, and you need not doubt but it has been with great applause.

<sup>1</sup> See M. Summers, *Dryden*, v, p. 294.

<sup>2</sup> *The Rape or, The Innocent Impostors* by Dr Nicholas Brady, D.D. For Shadwell's part in getting the play produced, see *The Works of Thomas Shadwell*, ed. M. Summers, 1927, i, pp. ccxxix-ccxxxi. *London Gazette* advertises publication April 28-May 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Otway's* tragedy was reprinted 1692.

<sup>4</sup> This play had been frequently revived between 1660-82, the Traytor being considered one of Mohun's best parts. 'In the Year 1692 it was reviv'd, under the Title of the Tragedy of *Armida*.' Jacob, *op. cit.*, i, p. 297. *City Mercury* advertises publication, July 4, 1692.

<sup>5</sup> It was not published until 1694. In a dedication dated Oct 1693, Banks complains that the play had been written ten years before.

<sup>6</sup> Mr Summers gives the date of production as 12 or 13 April. Dryden, *op. cit.*, vi, p. 244. 'This Play was acted with great Applause, notwithstanding it was misrepresented by some of Mr Dryden's Enemies at Court.' Jacob, *op. cit.*, i, p. 85.

456 *Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660–1700*

A letter in verse to Dryden and a long critique of the play follow. Extracts from the latter have been quoted in Dryden, *The Dramatic Works*, ed M Summers, v, p 294.

May 1692, p 26.

The OPERA of which I have spoke to you in my former hath at last appear'd, and continues to be represented daily, it is call'd, The Fairy Queen<sup>1</sup> The Drama is originally Shakespeares, the Music and Decorations are extraordinary I have heard the Dances commended, and without doubt the whole is very entertaining

We are promised Mr Crown's *Regulus*, before the Long Vacation, As also a Comedy by Mr Shadwell, whose Genius for that sort of Poetry, is sufficiently known to the Ingenious

June 1692, Licensed July 17, p 18.

*Regulus*,<sup>2</sup> with the Factions of Carthage, by Mr Crown, was acted the last week, that Tragedy is intermix'd with a vein of Comedy You have seen his Works in both Terence tells us, *Dubiam fortunam esse scenicam*, and if that great Author had occasion to complain, those of our Age may well comfort themselves if the Town deceives their expectation

July 1692, Licensed July 20, p. 24

We have had no new Play since *Regulus*, and 'tis very likely that we shall have none till the next Term.

Oct 1692, p. 24

Henry the Second, King of England, A new Play, by the Author of that call'd *Edward the Third*,<sup>3</sup> which gave such universal satisfaction, hath been acted several times with applause. It is a Tragedy with a mixture of Comedy . . Had you seen it acted, you would own that an Evening is pass'd very agreeably, when at a Representation of that pleasing Piece

We are promis'd a Comedy by Mr Shadwell<sup>4</sup> in a short time, and two or three Plays after that, which will be a pleasing Entertainment for us this Winter.

Nov. 1692, p. 21.

Passages announcing the deaths of Shadwell and Mountfort are quoted in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Shadwell*, ed M Summers, I, p. ccxlv

Dec 1692, p 15

We are like to be without new Plays this month and the next, the death of Mr Mountfort, and that of Mr Leigh<sup>5</sup> soon after him being partly the cause of this delay. The first that is promised us is a Comedy by Mr Southern, whose Plays are written with too much Politeness and Wit, not to be read by you with uncommon pleasure

<sup>1</sup> An operatic adaptation of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, attributed to Elkanah Settle Downes says it was superior to *King Arianur* and *The Prophetess* in ornaments and that 'The Court and Town were wonderfully satisfy'd with it, but the expenses in setting it out being so great, the Company got very little by it'. *Op cit.*, p. 42 *London Gazette* advertises it May 5-7

<sup>2</sup> This play was not published until over a year later. *London Gazette* advertises it Nov. 5-13, 1693, though the title-page is dated 1694. See *post*, p 457

<sup>3</sup> Attributed to John Bancroft Jacob says of *Henry II*, 'this met with good success', *op cit.*, I, p. 9. *London Gazette* advertises publication Nov. 24-28, 1692.

<sup>4</sup> *The Volunteers* produced posthumously Nov 1692 *London Gazette* advertises publication Dec. 15-19.

<sup>5</sup> William Mountfort and Anthony Leigh, actors

Vol II, Jan 1692/3, p. 28.

A Duke and no Duke,<sup>1</sup> being often acted now, and scarce, is reprinted, with the addition of a curious Preface, by our Laureat, concerning Farce

Mr Southerne's New Comedy, call'd, The Maid's last Prayers, or Any rather than fail, was acted the 3d time this evening, and is to be acted again to morrow. It discovers much knowledge of the Town in its Author, and its Wit and purity of Diction are particularly commended

Mr Congreve hath written a Comedy, which will be acted in a little time, and is to be call'd, The Old Batchelor

Feb 1692/3, p. 61

The success of Mr Congreve's Old Batchelor<sup>2</sup> has been so extraordinary, that I can tell you nothing new of that Comedy, you have doubtless read it before this, since it has been already printed thrice<sup>3</sup>. And indeed the Wit which is diffus'd through it, makes it lose but few of those Charms in the Perusal, which yield such pleasure in the Representation. Mr Congreve will in some time give us another play; you may judge by this how acceptable it will be

We have had since a Comedy, call'd, the Wary Widow, or Sir Noisy Parrot, by Henry Higden Esq., I send you here the Prologue to it by Sir Charles Sedley, and you are too great an Admirer of Shakespeare, not to assent to the Praises given to the Fruits of his rare Genius, of which I may say as Ovid to Graecinus,

Quos prior est mirata, sequens Theatra sonant

The prologue follows.

After Easter will be acted a new Comedy by Mr Durfy

April 1693, p. 130.

Since my last we have had a Comedy by Mr Durfey, 'tis called the Richmond Heiress or a Woman once in the Right<sup>4</sup>. And since that another by Mr George Powell, call'd a very good Wife,<sup>5</sup> which hath already been acted five times

Regulus, Or the Factions of Carthage, a Play by Mr Crowne, of which I spoke to you in some of my former, is now in the Press,<sup>6</sup> as also the Wary Widow, or Sir Noisy Parrot, a Comedy by Henry Higdon Esq.; which will be speedily published<sup>7</sup>

May 1693, p. 168

We have had since my last a new Comedy called The Female Vertuosos,<sup>8</sup> something in it was borrowed from Molières Femmes Savantes, and as it hath Wit and Humour, it cannot but please in the perusal, as in the representation

Nov 1693, p. 374

Mr Durfey's Richmond Heiress has been Revis'd, and Acted several times, with Alterations and Amendments. We are to have this Winter a Play by him, call'd Don Quixote.

<sup>1</sup> Tate's alteration of Aston Cockam's *Trapolin A Supposed Prince*, originally printed 1685

<sup>2</sup> 'This Comedy was acted with a general Applause' Jacob, *op. cit.*, I, p. 42

<sup>3</sup> The 3rd edition is advertised in the *London Gazette*, March 23-27.

<sup>4</sup> Nicoll gives production date as c. Feb 1692/3, *op. cit.*, p. 361. Easter Sunday fell on April 16 so that it must have been acted after the middle of the month

<sup>5</sup> Gildon, *A Comparison Between the Two Stages*, p. 24, has the following 'Ramb. What was its Fate? Sull. Damn'd, damn'd, as it deserved', but this was evidently untrue since Powell in his dedication speaks of the 'unexpected success of this Play.'

<sup>6</sup> See *ante*, p. 456, note 2

<sup>7</sup> *London Gazette* advertises it 'As it was lately Acted', May 29-June 1, 1693

<sup>8</sup> Jacob, *op. cit.*, I, p. 275. 'Acted at the Queens Theatre [D.G.] with Applause.' *London Gazette* advertises it June 22-26, 1693. By Thomas Wright



## 458 *Restoration Stage in Newspapers and Journal, 1660–1700*

The Tragedy by Mr Banks, which I told you was printed, has been lately publish'd, it's call'd The Innocent Usurper, or the Lady Jane Grey.<sup>1</sup> We are impatiently expecting a Play by Mr Dryden, 'tis of the Nature of his Spanish Fryar

We are also to have a Tragedy by Mr Southern, a Comedy by Mr Crown, and the Tragedy of Pyrrhus, by Mr H.<sup>2</sup> I need not say any thing of Mr Congreve's Double-Dealer,<sup>3</sup> (the only new Play since my last) after the Character which Mr Dryden has given of it.<sup>4</sup>

Followed by lines to Congreve by Wm. Dove.

Jan /Feb. 1694, p. 26.

Whatever Mr Dryden writes spreads so soon every where, that I can tell you no news of his Love Triumphant, or Nature will prevail since that Play has been printed long enough to have reach'd your hands before this, and I do not doubt, but that when you did read it, particularly the serious Scenes, you wisht that it might not be, as he intends, his last.

March 1694, p. 63.

Mr Southern's new Play call'd The Fatal Marriage, or, The Innocent Adultery,<sup>5</sup> has been so kindly receiv'd, that you are by this time no stranger to its merit. As the world has done it justice, and it is above my praise, I need not expatiate on that subject.

'Tis not altogether strange for a Play to be less kindly receiv'd immediately after one that has deservedly ingross'd all the Applause which the Town can well bestow in some time on new Dramatic Entertainments. Perhaps Mr Settle may partly impute to this, the want of success of a new Tragedy of his which was lately acted, 'tis called, The Ambitious Slave: or, The Generous Revenge.<sup>6</sup>

May 1694, p. 134.

We have had two new Comedies since my last, the first call'd Have at all, or the Midnight Adventure, by Mr Joseph Williams;<sup>7</sup> the other call'd The Married Beau,<sup>8</sup> or the curious Impertinent, by Mr Crown, already acted many times. Mr Dufey's Don Quixot,<sup>9</sup> which is impatiently expected, is to be the next.

June 1694.

The first Part of Mr Dufey's Don Quixote was so well received, that we have had a second Part of that Comical History<sup>10</sup> acted lately, which doubtless must be thought as entertaining as the first; since in this hot season it could bring such a numerous audience.

<sup>1</sup> Term Catalogues, June 1694, II, p. 511. Title-page is dated 1694.

<sup>2</sup> By Charles Hopkins Nicoll dates the production c. Aug 1695. *London Gazette* advertises it as Acted at L.I.F. Aug. 22–26, 1695 and L.I.F. did not open until April 30, 1695.

<sup>3</sup> Jacob, *op. cit.*, I, p. 43. 'This Play did not meet with the Encouragement as the former; neither had it equal Success with any of Mr Congreve's latter Dramatick Pieces.'

<sup>4</sup> The lines 'To my Dear Friend, Mr Congreve on His Comedy, call'd The Double-Dealer' were prefixed to the play which seems already to have been published by Nov. *London Gazette* advertises it Dec. 4–7, 1693, title-page has 1694.

<sup>5</sup> Jacob, *op. cit.*, I, p. 246. 'This Play appear'd on the Stage with vast Applause, the Distress being extremely moving.' *London Gazette* advertises it March 19–22.

<sup>6</sup> Jacob, *op. cit.*, I, p. 222. 'This play met with but ill Success.'

<sup>7</sup> Not mentioned by Genest or Nicoll. *Stage Cyclopaedia* says it was not printed.

<sup>8</sup> Jacob, *op. cit.*, I, p. 55. 'This is esteem'd a good Play, and has been often acted with general Approbation.' *London Gazette* advertises it June 14–18.

<sup>9</sup> Jacob, *op. cit.*, I, p. 9. 'This Play was acted with very great Applause.'

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid* 'This Play was likewise acted with Applause.' *London Gazette* advertises songs of Pt. II, July 2–5 and July 19–23.

Oct /Nov. 1694, p 276.

I have only just room to tell you, that we have had a new Comedy by Mr Ravenscroft, 'tis call'd, *The Canterbury Jest*s, or a Bargain Broken.<sup>1</sup>

We are promised several Other new Plays shortly Here are some Verses on a Poet whose old ones are still most acceptable to the Town, tho they want the Charms of Novelty

On Shakespear by Mr. G.<sup>2</sup>

Shakespear, the Prop and Glory of the Stage,  
Adorn'd a rough and charms a polish'd Age,  
True as the Life the vocal Painter Drew,  
Yet the nice Paths of Learning never knew.  
His matchless works proceeded from his Wit,  
The learned proud to read, and copy what he writ.  
Each line the force of manly Sence displays,  
In equal Words he mighty Thoughts arrays,  
And, taught by Nature above Art to write,  
Scorns his dull Critics and their feeble Spight.  
Oh could but Anthony or Brutus know  
What words and thoughts his lines on them bestow,  
Amaz'd they'd blush to find themselves outdone,  
Yet thank the Poet, and their Pictures own  
How great is he by whose creating Mind  
Great Romans greater than themselves we find!  
How well the Bard, to his unrivall'd Praise,  
Could manage Souls and every Passion raise!  
Hark! how bold Brutus do's harangue the crowd,  
Moves the dull Rout, till it assents aloud  
Now hear how Anthony o're Caesar mourns,  
And on his Foes the raging Tempest turns!  
Seeing how the daring Chiefs with heat debate,  
With Flegm reflect, and struggling still with fate  
Those last of Romans, more than Men in all,  
Not to outlive their Countries Freedom, fall.  
Such scenes let Shakespear's snarling Critics, write,  
And cease to bark till they have Teeth to bite.

SYBIL ROSENFELD.

London.

<sup>1</sup> *The Canterbury Guests.*

<sup>2</sup> The Contents' Table gives Mr C.

## RONSARD'S POETIC GROWTH<sup>1</sup>

### II

1550 to 1560.

Two or three months after the appearance of *Les Quatre premiers livres des Odes*, that is to say in April, 1550, Ronsard published a new Pindaric ode, *Ode de la Paix Au Roi* (II, 77)<sup>2</sup> in celebration of the recently signed treaty between France and England. The ode, which in the 1552 edition was put at the head of the volume, is very long, and poetically quite uninteresting. It contains many imitations from Pindar, all from the Pythian odes, including a long myth of 200 lines, in which Ronsard sketches in broad outline the legend of Francus, the son of Hector, the ancestor of the Kings of France. He hints that, if he is encouraged, he will make him the hero of an epic poem. But he warns the King bluntly that he expects some return for his work. No benefice, in short, no *Franciade*. The fame of the King's ancestors has been buried by envious time, the glory of his father alone survives, because he loved poetry.

For nearly a year Ronsard was silent. Then in March or April, 1551<sup>3</sup> he contributed four odes, one being a translation of a Latin ode by Daurat to *Le Tombeau de Marguerite de Valois*, edited by his friend Nicolas Denisot, painter and poet, who lived for three years in this country as tutor to the daughters of the Protector Somerset. The third of these odes has thus much of interest that it ends with the lines:

Et fay que devant mon Prince  
Desormais plus ne me pince  
La tenaille de Meln

When it was reprinted in September, 1552, Ronsard, with a view to a reconciliation with Saint-Gelais, altered the last line to 'le caquet des envieux'. The last of the four odes, *Aux cendres de Marguerite de Valois. Ode pastorale* (L. II, 404) has considerable charm. The 'shepherds' are charged to pay an annual homage to their queen in words which recall *De l'élection de son sépulcre*. But especially noticeable is the ease and skill with which Ronsard handles his six-lined stanza of heptasyllables:

Aux rais cornuz de la Lune  
Assemblez sous la nuit brune

<sup>1</sup> Continued from *Mod Lang Rev* xxix (1934), No. 1

<sup>2</sup> M. Laumonnier knows only four copies, of which one is in the Bibl. Sainte-Geneviève, one in his own library, one in that of Baron James de Rothschild (Cat. Picot I, 472) and a fourth at Grenoble.

<sup>3</sup> The dedication is dated March 25, 1551.

Vos Naiades et vos Dieux,  
 Et avecque voz Dryades  
 Donnez lui dix mille aubades  
 Du flageol melodieux.

M. Laumonier calls attention to the resemblances between this ode and Marot's eclogue on the death of Louise of Savoy, Margaret's mother. In both poems are passages evidently inspired by Virgil's eclogues, in Marot's by the tenth and in Ronsard's by the fifth. M. Laumonier also notes that the general tone of the odes of the *Tombeau* is less pagan and more Christian than in Ronsard's first volume, and that there is no trace in them of Pindarism. He suggests, very plausibly, that this change was due to the representations of friends, who advised him to temper his cult of antiquity with respect for the tradition of his French predecessors.

Ronsard, however, though he might write a pastoral in the manner of Marot, had not entirely abandoned his allegiance to Pindar. In July, 1550—this is M. Laumonier's suggested date—he wrote a longer and more ambitious Pindaric ode than any that he had written before. It contains 816 lines divided into 24 triads, and is addressed to Michel de l'Hospital, the future Chancellor of France, who had recently been appointed Chancellor to Margaret, the sister of Henri II.<sup>1</sup> It was an expression of gratitude for the support that he had given to the poet in his quarrel with Saint-Gelais. Contrary to the practice of Pindar, Ronsard plunges at once into the myth, which occupies no less than 18 triads. It tells how Jupiter, at a banquet of the gods, having been entranced by three Orphic legends sung by the Muses, gave them at Calliope's request the power of enchanting the world with harmony, together with full sovereignty over poets and poetry. In the 13th and 14th triads and the strophe of the 15th Ronsard puts in the mouth of Jupiter an exposition of that theory, derived from Plato, of *fureur poétique* to which I called attention in my former article. In all this part of the ode there are passages of considerable beauty, especially the description of the palace of Oceanus, the giver of the banquet, under the sea,<sup>2</sup> and Calliope's prayer.<sup>3</sup> As the Muses, their request having been granted, leave the palace, Ronsard invokes them on his own behalf.

Dieu vous gard, jeunesse divine,  
 Rechauffez moy l'affection  
 De tordre les plys de ceste Hynne  
 Au mieux de leur perfection

Donnez moy le sçavoir d'eslire  
 Les vers qui sçavent contenter,  
 Et mignon des Graces, chanter  
 Mon *Francion* sur vostre Lyre<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> L II, 119

<sup>2</sup> Epode iv and strophe v

<sup>3</sup> Triad xi.

Though this great ode was written in 1550, it was not printed till September or October, 1552,<sup>1</sup> when it was joined to the five odes mentioned above and five others to form the Fifth Book of Odes, part of a volume entitled *Les Amours de P. de Ronsard Vandomois. Ensemble Le cinquiesme de ses Odes*.<sup>2</sup>

The *Amours*, which occupy less than half the volume (103 pages out of 239), are a sequence of love-sonnets in honour of Cassandre, who in November, 1546, had married Jean Peigne, Seigneur de Pré. At the beginning of the volumes are portraits of Ronsard and Cassandre, which M. Laumonier believes to be the work of Nicolas Denisot. Thus Ronsard proclaims himself as the Petrarch of France with Cassandre for his Laura. He was not, indeed, the first Frenchman to write a sonnet-sequence in imitation of Petrarch, for, besides Du Bellay's *Olive*, of which a second and enlarged edition appeared in 1550, another friend, Pontus de Tyard, had published his *Erreurs amoureuses* in 1549, the same year as *Olive*, and a continuation in 1551. But Ronsard did not believe that either of his predecessors had really learnt 'l'art de bien Petrarquiser'.<sup>3</sup> Had he himself learnt it? The general verdict is that, though he has learnt the outward signs of the Petrarchan code, that is to say, of the Petrarchan attitude to unrequited love, he is wholly alien to its spirit. It could not have been otherwise. What was there in common between a man, whose love was chiefly of the senses and neither deep nor constant, and a man whose love was true and abiding and was mostly of the mind and soul?<sup>4</sup> When Ronsard is praising the physical beauties of his mistress, he is at least sincere, though he is often grossly sensual. But when he is enlarging on her mental and moral virtues, or reiterating vows of eternal constancy, he is merely expressing feelings which are not his own but Petrarch's. The only two qualities that redeem a sequence of love-sonnets from its inevitable defect of monotony are passion, which may be imaginary so long as it is imaginative, and sincerity. Petrarch's sonnets are the sincere record of a true love-story with all its alternating moods of joy and melancholy, of discontent and resignation. Ronsard's sonnets for Hélène are the record of a less lofty love, of a love tarnished by vanity and desire, but they are at any rate a true record, and as such engage our interest and sympathy. But in the *Amours de Cassandre*, lacking, as they do, both passion and sincerity, the monotony is un-

<sup>1</sup> The printing was finished on September 30.

<sup>2</sup> There is a copy in the *Bibl. municipale* of Orleans and an imperfect one in the Brit. Mus. C 57 a 31 (1).

<sup>3</sup> See *Élégie à Cassandre*, published in the *Bocage* of 1554 (L, I, 110).

<sup>4</sup> This is admirably worked out by M. Laumonier in *Ronsard poète lyrique*, pp. 477-513.

relieved. We must not, however, be blind to the merits of individual sonnets or fail to appreciate the skill with which Ronsard reproduces the conventions of Petrarch and his followers. And he succeeds in this, not so much by direct imitation, for comparatively few of the sonnets are direct imitations, even in part, but because he was saturated with his model's poetry. In fact, as M. Laumonier points out,<sup>1</sup> the odes and songs in which he has Petrarchised are much more in the tradition of the *Canzoniere* than some of the sonnets, as for instance the *chanson*, *Las, je n'eusse jamais pensé*, which immediately follows the *Amours*.

It is significant that among the best sonnets in the volume are those in which Ronsard refers to his home—the purest source of his inspiration—as, for example, *Sainte Gastine, heureuse secretaire* (cxxxii; L. I, 80), *Je te hay peuple* (xciii, L. I, 59), *En ce pendant que<sup>2</sup> tu frappes au but* (cxxxiiii; L. I, 81), and *Quand ces beaulx yeulx jugeront que je meure* (lii, L. I, 30). Not so good, to my mind, is *Ciel, airs, et vents* (lvii, L. I, 32), in which in the manner of the Italian sonneteers he apostrophises in detail the beauties of nature round his home.<sup>3</sup> In another sonnet of considerable merit he regards his mistress in the light of a theme for his immortal verse, as a rival to Petrarch's Laura. It is worth quoting as an expression of Ronsard's confidence in his high destiny:

Que n'ay-je, Dame, et la plume et la grace  
Divine autant que j'ay la volonté,  
Par mes escritz tu seroys surmonté,  
Vieil enchanteur des vieulz rochers de Thrace<sup>4</sup>

Plus hault encor que Pindare, ou qu'Horace,  
J'appenderoys à ta divinité  
Un livre enfé de telle gravité,  
Que Du Bellay lui quitteroyt la place.

Si vive encor Laure par l'Univers  
Ne fuit volant dessus les Tusques vers,  
Que nostre siecle heureusement estime,

Comme ton nom, honneur des vers françoys,  
Hault élevé par le vent de ma voix  
S'en voleroyt sus l'aïe de ma rime.<sup>5</sup>

Indispensable themes of the Petrarchan sonnet-sequence are descriptions of the physical charms of the beloved one and of her mental and moral virtues, and Ronsard readily follows the prevailing fashion. Too often he gives us a mere catalogue of beauties—hair like gold, eyes like stars, a mouth of coral, teeth of pearl, complexion of lilies and roses, breath

<sup>1</sup> *Op cit*, pp. 483–5.

<sup>2</sup> Altered in 1578 to *Pendant, Baïf*. It is well translated by Cary.

<sup>3</sup> Petrarch set the fashion with *Leti fiori e felici* (cxi).

<sup>4</sup> Orpheus.

<sup>5</sup> No lxiv (L. I, 35).

sweeter than Eastern perfumes.<sup>1</sup> But sometimes he confines himself to the praise of a single feature, as in *Sort que son or se crespe lentement* (lxxvi, L. I, 44), where the picture of Cassandre's golden tresses, arranged now in one way now in another, really appeals to the imagination. So does another sonnet, *Qui voudra voyr* (lxi, L. I, 31), in which the poet, after praising Cassandre's beauty, majesty, gentleness and other virtues in general terms, represents her as a goddess whom it is bliss to behold and for love of whom it is greater bliss to die.<sup>2</sup>

Those sonnets too in which Ronsard associates some place, a house or a meadow, with his love, are happily inspired because they record an emotion which was once no doubt a very real one. Such are *Veufve maison des beaulx yeulx de Madame* (cli, L. I, 89) and *Voyez le boys, que ma sainte Angelette* (cxxi; L. I, 80).<sup>3</sup> Ronsard's first sight of Cassandre is the theme of another sonnet, perhaps the most exquisite of the whole volume, *Comme un chevreuil* (lix; L. I, 29). But it is an almost literal translation of the third sonnet of Bembo's *Le Rime*.<sup>4</sup>

At the end of the volume, after the Fifth Book of the Odes, comes a piece, not mentioned on the title-page, entitled *Les Bacchanales ou le Folastrissime Voyage d'Hercueil pres Paris* (L. v, 213). It celebrates an excursion, which Jean Dorat and his pupils of the College of Coqueret made in July, 1549, to Arcueil, a few miles south of Paris on the Bièvre. It has a special interest in that it gives us the names of Ronsard's fellow-students who shared his enthusiasms, and to whom he gave the name of the Brigade.<sup>5</sup>

Dieu gard la sçavante troppe,  
Calliope  
Grave au ciel votre renom,  
Bellay, Baif et encores  
Toy qui dores  
. La France en l'or de ton nom

But the poem is so well known that it need not be discussed here. I will only call attention to the masterly ease with which Ronsard carries on the lively movement of this gay and joyous ode, and with what grace and precision he handles its dancing measure. The metre is a five-line stanza

<sup>1</sup> As for instance, *Ny ce coral* (xcv, L. I, 60), *Cœur, qui mes pleurs* (cv, L. I, 65) and *Ce ris plus doux* (cx, L. I, 68). Cp. Bembo, *Le Rime*, xiv. Du Bellay mocks at this habit in his *Contre les Petrarquistes*. See ll 17-20.

<sup>2</sup> The octet is imitated from Petrarch's *Qual donna attende* (cciii).

<sup>3</sup> M. Laumonier refers to Bembo's *Amor che meco dei diversi* (by pupils of Bembo) i and iv, 1545-7. There is no evident borrowing from the sonneteers of the fifteenth century to whom Maurice Scève owes so much for lines 5-12, but 10-12, as he points out, are inspired by Petrarch (sonnet lxxvi).

<sup>4</sup> M. Laumonier notes ten imitations from Bembo in the First Book of the *Amours*. Ronsard is also indebted to *Rime* (*Le Rime*, xii).

<sup>5</sup> In 1584 30 stanzas were suppressed and at least four names disappeared with them.

of heptasyllables and trisyllables (7f 3f 7m 7f<sup>2</sup> 3f<sup>2</sup> 7m). It is used by Marot for his translation of the 38th Psalm. As this is a penitential psalm, one of those appointed by our Church for Ash Wednesday, he could not have chosen a more unsuitable metre, whereas for Ronsard's theme the choice could not have been bettered.

In one respect the volume of 1552 shows a distinct advance on that of 1550, and that is in sureness of touch both as regards language and metre. Alike in the Pindaric ode to Michel de l'Hospital, the pastoral ode on Margaret of Navarre, the love-sonnets to Cassandre and *Le Voyage d'Hercueil*, each with its widely different treatment, Ronsard proves himself to be a skilled craftsman, perfectly at home. Yet the *Voyage* must have been written as early as 1549, the two odes according to M. Laumonier in 1550, while the same authority thinks it probable that the earliest sonnets date as far back as 1547.<sup>1</sup> If these dates are correct—and M. Laumonier gives very good reasons for them—even though the great majority of the sonnets may belong to 1550 and 1551 they show that whatever weakness of execution there was in Ronsard's earliest volume the practice of his art had greatly improved his skill, and that in the very year of its publication he handled his tools no longer as an apprentice but as a master.

In January, 1553, as the result of the friendly diplomacy of Michel de l'Hospital and Jean Morel, a reconciliation took place between Ronsard and Melin de Saint-Gelais, the latter acting not only for himself but for the older school in general. In order to propitiate his opponents Ronsard had undertaken to suppress the prefaces to his first volume, to abstain from strange novelties in his verse: to write a friendly ode to Saint-Gelais; and to omit the six stanzas of the Ode to Margaret of Savoy in the Fifth Book which disclosed Saint-Gelais's malicious attitude towards Ronsard at Court.<sup>2</sup> All these promises were in due course fulfilled. About March, 1553, a new edition of the first four books of odes appeared,<sup>3</sup> in which both prefaces were suppressed and also two odes (II, XXI and IV, II) in which the ignorance of the older school was attacked. Eighteen other odes were also omitted, but more than half of these were restored in later editions and only seven in all, including II, XXI and IV, II, were definitely rejected. The same fate was shared by half of those in the *Bocage*. Among the definitely discarded odes are *Il est maintenant temps de boire* (III, iv), which, as we saw, is a clever mosaic from Horace (IV, iii),

<sup>1</sup> See sonnets xiv and xcvm.

<sup>2</sup> See P. de Nolhac, *Rev. d'hist. litt.* vi (1899), pp. 351-6, where De l'Hospital's Latin letter to Morel is printed and analysed, and P. Laumonier, *Ronsard poète lyrique*, pp. 90-3.

<sup>3</sup> *Les Odes de P. de Ronsard Vendomois*. Very rare.



and the short ode of two stanzas, in which he calls down vengeance on the thief who stole his favourite copy of that author, and two rather interesting odes from the *Bocage*, the early one *A son luc* (II) and *A un sien ami fascché de suivre la court* (XIII). There are only two new pieces in the volume, *Fantaisie à sa dame* and a sonnet to the same, in which the gold of her hair, the roses and lilies of her cheeks, the coral of her lips, and the ivory of her teeth (*les blancs sommets de vos couteaux*) are duly catalogued.<sup>1</sup>

Ronsard's next published work, entitled *Livret de Folastries*, appeared without the name of the author in April, 1553.<sup>2</sup> It comprised eight *Folastries*, *Dithyrambes* (a single poem), seventeen *Epigrams*, translated from the Greek Anthology, and two sonnets. Nearly all the *Folastries* and the two sonnets are indecent, some of them grossly so, and several of his friends, including, it is thought, Michel de l'Hospital, gently remonstrated with him. Ronsard himself evidently thought that some apology was needed, for he has put on the title-page the well-known couplet of Catullus, *Nam castum esse decet*, a couplet hardly less appropriate to Ronsard than to his Latin model. That he followed the advice of Du Bellay in the *Deffence*—*Adopte moy...ces coulans et mignars hendecasyllabes, à l'exemple d'un Catulle, d'un Pontan et d'un Second*—and took Catullus and his neo-Latin imitators as his model has been clearly shown by M. Laumonier. But it is characteristic of Ronsard that, unlike Catullus, he allows his pen to flow on unchecked. The first *Folastrie*, for instance, which is more remarkable for triviality, including the exaggerated accumulation of diminutives, than for indecency, trickles on for 174 lines.

We may pass on to a volume of greater interest, the second edition of the *Amours*, which appeared in May.<sup>3</sup> Two of the sonnets in the original edition (lxi and clvii) are suppressed, and there are 39 new ones. We find in the latter the same imitation in an exaggerated form of his model, the same enumeration of his mistress's charms, the same attestation of his constancy, the same lamentation over his unhappy state. There are none of outstanding merit, but one of the best and from its reference to the well-known portrait-painter, François Clouet, one of the most interesting is the following:

<sup>1</sup> L. VI, 88. This sonnet was omitted in 1560.

<sup>2</sup> The printing was finished on April 20. There is a copy in the Arsenal library, and two or three other copies are known.

<sup>3</sup> The printing was finished on May 24. There is a copy in the *Bib. Nat.* and one in the Brit. Mus. C. 40 c. 72. In the *Rev. du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, XII (1925), pp. 162 ff., M. Abel Lefranc points out that there are two distinct issues, both with the same *achevé d'imprimer* of May 24, 1553. The *Bib. Nat.* has copies of both, the Brit. Mus. only the later one.

Telle qu'elle est, dedans ma souvenance  
 Je la sen peinte, et sa bouche, et ses yeus,  
 Son dous regard, son parler gratieus,  
 Son dous maintien, sa douce contenance.  
 Un seul Janet, honneur de nostre France,  
 De ses craions ne la porteroit mieus,  
 Que d'un Archer le trait ingenieus  
 M'a peint au cœur sa vive remembrance.  
 Dans le cœur donque au fond d'un diamant  
 J'ai son portrait, que je suis plus amant  
 Que mon cœur mesme. O sainte portraiture,  
 De ce Janet l'artifice mourra  
 Frapé du tans, mais le tien demourra.<sup>1</sup>  
 Pour estre vif apres ma sepulture.<sup>2</sup>

Of some merit and interest also is a sonnet which appears in M. de Nolhac's *Anthology* (p. 81)<sup>3</sup> with the first line altered, greatly for the better, to:

Plus que les Rois, leurs sceptres, et leur bien

and with some other improvements, also made in 1578. We learn from it that Cassandre's singing to her own accompaniment on her lute was one of the charms which captivated her lover.

The sonnets are followed by four odes. The first is in fulfilment of Ronsard's promise to write a complimentary poem to Melin de Saint-Gelais. The second and third are remarkable for their pessimism and melancholy. The second is addressed to the well-known scholar, Marc-Antoine de Muret, in whose Latin play of *Julius Caesar* Montaigne acted at the College of Guyenne and who wrote the music for one of Ronsard's *Amours*<sup>4</sup> (xxxiv) and a commentary for this second edition. It is not really an ode, but a long poem in decasyllable couplets, and is entitled *Les Isles Fortunées*. It is an invitation to Muret, in view of the Turkish peril that menaces Europe, of the lack of patronage for starving poets and of the pitiable condition generally of this wicked world, to sail with him and all their friends—that is to say the Brigade—to the Fortunate Islands.

Pour vivre heureux en l'heur d'un si beau lieu.

The next poem, addressed to the son of his publisher, the widow of Maurice de la Porte, is equally pessimistic. In lines borrowed from

<sup>1</sup> In 1578 this line was greatly improved into *Dedans le cœur le tien me demourra*.

<sup>2</sup> No cxxviii (L 1, 103).

<sup>3</sup> *Poésies choisies de Ronsard*, 1924. No cvii (L 1, 54)

<sup>4</sup> There is a musical appendix to the *Amours* of 1552, which is reproduced by Laumonier. It gives the music for four voices which Certon, Janequin and Goudimel, the chief professional musicians of the day, and Muret, an amateur, composed for six sonnets and three other pieces. See C. Comte and P. Laumonier, *Ronsard et les musiciens du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, *Rev. d'hist. litt.* vii (1900), pp. 345 ff., J. Tiersot, *Ronsard et la musique de son temps*, 1903; E. J. Dent in *Modern France* (Cambridge, 1922), pp. 633-5.

Simonides of Ceos Ronsard addresses man as *chétif et misérable*, while from Simonides of Amorgos he takes a passage which ends with

Bref, on ne voit chose qui vive,  
Qui vive franche de douleur,  
Mais sur tout, la race chétive  
Des hommes foisonne en malheur.

There is also a passage from Mimnermus, which together with those from the two Simonides Ronsard would have found in the *Florilegium* of Stobaeus.<sup>1</sup> Finally, we come to the glory of the volume, the famous ode to Cassandre, *Mignonne, allons voir si la rose*. In its concentrated brevity, its dramatic form with its three scenes—the invitation, the death of the rose, the moral—its simple language without a word that one could bear to see altered, its entrancing rhythm, and its faultless rhymes, it is a little miracle of perfection. The theme is an old old commonplace, which poets of all ages and all countries have woven into song, but Ronsard's direct source of inspiration is Ausonius's fourteenth idyll,<sup>2</sup> which nine years earlier Desperiers had paraphrased in a poem of much charm.<sup>3</sup> Ronsard's ode had the success that it deserved, and, set to music by Casteley, it was soon on everybody's lips

The only other volume that Ronsard published in 1553 was a new and slightly augmented edition of the *Fifth Book of Odes* with *La harangue qui fit monseigneur le Duc de Guise aus Soudan de Metz*.<sup>4</sup> This poem, which celebrates the successful defence of Metz by the Duke of Guise against the troops of Charles V, is evidently another bid for patronage. It is written in an epic style, with reminiscences of Homer, especially in the description of Guise's armour. Classical and national inspiration are cleverly blended. But Ronsard is not yet at home with alexandrines, and the whole poem must be regarded as in the nature of an exercise by a would-be poet-laureate. The addition to the Fifth Book of Odes consists of 12 pieces which had already appeared, including *Les Bacchanales*, and of eight new pieces, of which only two are odes. There are two sonnets, an epitaph on Jean Martin by way of a dialogue between a passer-by and the *genie* of the dead man and three elegies, of which the last, addressed to Jean de La Peruse, ends on a line,

*Voler par tout sa vive renommée,*

<sup>1</sup> First printed at Venice in 1536; with a Latin translation by Gesner at Zurich 1543, and at Basle 1548. There is a Paris edition of 1552

<sup>2</sup> The last couplet is

Collige, virgo, rosas, dum flos novus et nova pubes:  
Et memor esto aevum sic properare tuum.

<sup>3</sup> See Laumonier, *Ronsard poète lyrique*, pp 582-91.

<sup>4</sup> *Bib. Nat. Rés.* p. Ye 127

which, as M. Laumonier truly says, runs like a refrain through all Ronsard's work

We saw that nearly half the Fifth Book was taken up by two long Pindaric odes, in which Ronsard put forth his full strength, and in the longer of which, the ode to Michel de l'Hospital, he came nearer to Pindar than he had ever done before. This imposing ode had added to his fame, but it had not brought him popularity or patronage. With the sense of reality which lay behind his youthful enthusiasm he recognised that De l'Hospital and other friends were right in their advice that if he wanted popularity and patronage he must bring down his Muse from her inaccessible heights and, leaving Pindar and other models alien to the Gallic genius, guide her into the main path of Gallic tradition. So he wrote no more Pindaric odes, but turned to Greek authors who would bear more readily the transplantation to French soil. Already in the second edition of the *Amours* he had borrowed from the *Florilegium* of Stobaeus, and in one of the few decent poems of *Les Follastries* he had amalgamated two well-known Anacreontics, Οὐ μοι μέλει Γύγας and Τὸν ἄργυρον τορεύσας, into the ode, *Du grand Turc je n'ay souci*. He read these, M. Laumonier points out, in the Greek Anthology which Janus Lascaris printed at Florence in 1495, but in March, 1554, Henri Estienne edited from a manuscript, which he had recently discovered in Italy, the *editio princeps* of Anacreon, that is to say, the poems of his numerous imitators which then passed under his name. In an *Odelette à Corydon* (L II, 433), one of four poems which he wrote under this title, Ronsard celebrates this discovery:

Verse donq, et reverse encor  
Dedans cette grand coupe d'or,  
Je vois boire à Henry Estienne,  
Qui des enfers nous a rendu  
Du vieil Anacreon perdu  
La douce Lyre Teienne<sup>1</sup>

The poem from which this verse is taken occurs in a new volume, entitled *Le Bocage*, which Ronsard published towards the close of 1554. A few days earlier the printing of another volume by him, *Les Meslanges*, had been finished, but it bears the date of 1555. The two volumes are so much alike in character that they may be considered together.<sup>2</sup> In both Ronsard borrows freely from 'Anacreon'—for five odes of *Le Bocage* and for no less than sixteen of *Les Meslanges*—and he nearly always repays his debt with interest. Of special charm are the *Ode ou Songe à François de*

<sup>1</sup> Anacreon was a native of Teos.

<sup>2</sup> The printing of *Le Bocage* by the widow of Maurice de La Porte was finished on November 27, and that of *Les Meslanges* by Gilles Corrozet on November 22.

*Revergat* (L. III, 214), in which there is a delightful rendering of Μεσονυκτίους ποθ' ὥπαις<sup>1</sup> and the above-mentioned *Odelette à Corydon* ('Επι μυσσίναις τεπέλαις), both of these in *Le Bocage*, and an imitation of one of the best-known Anacreontics, Μοῦσαι τὸν Ἑρωτα (L. II, 360), in *Les Meslanges* in which he has expanded the nine lines of the original into twenty-four. Another charming *Odelette à Corydon*, which begins with an adaptation from Τί με τοὺς νόμους διδάσκεις;

J'ay l'esprit tout ennuié  
D'avoir trop étudié  
Les Phenomenes d'Arate:

continues after l. 13 with a free rendering of portions of two well-known odes of Horace, *Aequam memento* (II, 3) and *Herculis ritu* (III, 14). The ode *Du grand Turc je n'ay souci*, which had appeared in *Les Follastries*, was reprinted in *Les Meslanges*, but with the latter part much enlarged and practically rewritten.<sup>2</sup>

There are twelve sonnets in *Le Bocage* and five in *Les Meslanges*, but only one is worth noticing, *Cesse tes pleurs, mon livre* (L. I, 207). Like all except one in this group and like two in the other group, it is in alexandrines. Hitherto Ronsard had used this line very sparingly, either in combination with shorter lines or once by itself, namely in the *Harangue de monseigneur le Duc de Guise*.<sup>3</sup> But in these two new volumes he makes much more use of it, both for sonnets, following the example of his friend Baif, in six sonnets of his *Amours* (December 1552), and for longer poems. The longest is the Hymn to Bacchus in *Les Meslanges*, dedicated to Jan Brinon, the gay-living and generous patron to whom the whole volume and six other pieces are dedicated. Both in the Hymn and in the two other poems in alexandrines, *Les Armes* (L. V, 30) and *La Chasse* (L. V, 37), we find passages that show a really successful handling of the metre, as for instance the description of Bacchus and his followers (ll. 109-32), which reminds one of Titian's great picture, the imitation of Horace's *Beatus ille qui procul negotiis* (*Les Armes*, ll. 103-14), and the greater part of *La Chasse*, a longish poem, in which Ronsard paraphrases Oppian for about sixty lines but is happily inspired for the rest by his

<sup>1</sup> The imitation begins at l. 10. The dedication was dropped in 1560. Blanchemain entitles it *L'Amour mourré*, but there is no authority for this. It is one of the Anacreontics translated by Herrick in his *Hesperides*.

<sup>2</sup> *Anacréon et les Poèmes Anacréontiques*, ed. A. Delboulle, Havre, 1891, is a charming little book. It contains the Greek text followed by translations and imitations by French poets of the sixteenth century. Translations of all the Anacreontics will be found in J. M. Edmonds, *Greek Elegy and Iambics with the Anacreontica* (The Loeb Classical Library), 1921.

<sup>3</sup> He says in his first preface to *La Franciade* that he was the first to bring alexandrines back into favour, but this may only mean that he gave encouragement to their use and perhaps used them himself in unpublished verses.

own love of sport In *Le Narssis*, which tells the story of Narcissus as related in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the alexandrine metre is also well handled. The actual story is preceded by a description of the spring, imitated from the neo-Latin poet Navagero, to which Ronsard's real love of the country gives great charm. The same love is apparent in the autobiographical Epistle to Ambroise de la Porte, which, however, is not in alexandrines but in decasyllables. Like *Le Narssis* it has much charm.

The alexandrines of *Le Bocage* are not so good as those of *Les Meslanges*. Those of the well-known elegy—it is really an epistle—to Pierre de Pascal,<sup>1</sup> which is very important from the autobiographical point of view, are distinctly poor. They are fairly good in the *Építaphe* on Philippe de Commines, though only by fits and starts, but they are poor again in those on Hugues Salet and Albert, the king's lute-player. Nor are they better in the half-a-dozen *Odes* and *Odelettes* in which they are employed. This inferiority of the alexandrines in *Le Bocage* to those of *Les Meslanges* seems to me to indicate a later date, but as the two volumes were published within a few days of one another there is no external evidence to confirm this. Probably Ronsard did not determine what he should put into each volume until he had arranged for their publication. They were both very successful, and in March 1555 a second edition of *Les Meslanges* was published. It contained, besides all the poems of the first edition, seven epigrams reprinted from the *Livret de Folastries*, an *odelette* to Jan Brinon and a short poem on his death, which happened while the volume was being printed.

(To be continued.)

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

<sup>1</sup> In 1560 Remy Belleau's name was substituted for Pascal's, and it is under his name that the elegy is generally known.

# GAITE DE LA TOR—AN ESSAY IN INTERPRETATION

ALTHOUGH the lines beginning *Gaite de la tor*—one of the few surviving examples of the Northern French *aubade*—have been exercising the ingenuity of scholars for more than a century, no really convincing explanation of the poem has yet been offered. The critics have vied with each other in the subtlety and intricacy of their theories, some of which border on the fantastic. It may, however, be helpful to consider the more important of these before passing on to a new interpretation.

I append a copy of the poem as found in Bartsch, *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, piece 47. The allocation of parts suggested by the different critics is indicated by the following letters L Lady, K. Knight, W. Watchman, C. Companion of Knight. (Schl. = Schlaeger, Res = Restori, Je. = Jeanroy, B. = Button )

Schl K	Res. K	Je C (W2)	B K	I Gaite de la tor, gardez entor les murs, se Deus vos voie! c'or sont a sejour dame et seignor, et larron vont en proie! hu et hu et hu et hu! je l'ai veu la jus soz la coudroie hu et hu et hu et hu! a bien pres l'ocirroie!	5        10
—	W	—	W		
—	—	W	—		
—	C	—	—		
K	L	C (W2)	K	II. D'un douz lai d'amor de Blancheflor, compains, vos chanterroie, ne fust la poor del traitor cui je redotterroie! hu et hu et hu et hu! je l'ai veu la jus soz la coudroie. hu et hu et hu et hu! a bien pres l'ocirroie!	15        20
—	W	—	W		
—	—	W	—		
—	C	—	—		
K	W	C (W2)	K	III Compainz, en error sui, k'a cest tor volentiers dormiroie. n'aez pas paor! voist a loisor, qui aler vuet par voie! hu et hu et hu et hu! or soit teu, compainz, a ceste voie. hu et hu! bien ai seu, que nous en avrons joie.	25        30
L	C	—	W		
K	—	—	—		
—	L	W	K		
L	K	—	—		

				IV.	
L	W	C (W2)	W	Ne sont pas p'usor li robeor, n'i a c'un, que je voie, qui gist en la flor soz covertor, cui nomer n'oseroie hu et hu et hu et hu ! or soit teu, compainz, a ceste voie hu et hu ! bien ai seu, que nous en avrons joie.	35      40
K	—	—	—		
—	L	W	K		
L	K	—	—		
				V.	
L	C	C (W2)	W	Cortois ameor, qui a sejour gisez en chambre coie, n'aez pas freor, que tresqu'a jor poez demener joie. hu et hu et hu et hu ! or soit teu, compainz, a ceste voie. hu et hu ! bien ai seu, que nous en avrons joie	45     50   55
K	—	—	—		
—	L	W	K		
L	K	—	—		
				VI.	
K	K	K	K	Gaite de la tor, vez mon retor de la, ou vos coie; d'amie et d'amor a cestui tor ai ceu, que plus amoie. hu et hu et hu et hu ! pou ai geu en la chambre de joie hu et hu ! trop m'a neu l'aube, qui me guerroie.	60      65
—	L	—	—		
				VII.	
K	L	K	K	Se salve l'onor au oriator estoit, tot tens voudroie, nuit feist del jor, ja mais dolor ne pesance n'avroie. hu et hu et hu et hu ! bien ai veu de biauté la monjoie. hu et hu ! c'est bien seu. gaite, a Deu tote voie !	70      75
—	K	—	—		

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P. Paris, *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xxiii, p. 811; G. Schlaeger<sup>r</sup>, *Studien über das Tagelied*, Jena, 1895; *Romana*, xxiv and xxxiii; Bartsch, *Deutsche Liederdschier* (quoted as *DLD*), 8th ed., 1928, Bartsch, *Chrestomathie provençale*, 3rd ed., 1875; Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie* (quoted as *APC*).



Paulin Paris first published the poem in 1832 in his edition of *Berthe aus grans piés* (p. 195) and reprinted it the following year in his *Roman-céro français* (pp. 66–9). He endeavoured to explain the poem as a conversation between the lady, the knight and the watchman. Later, in the *Histoire littéraire de la France* (Paris, 1856, xxiii, p. 811) he interpreted it as a conversation between the lady's husband (!) and the watchman, followed by a conversation between the watchman and the lover. In no other *aubade*, French, German or Provençal, does the lady's husband play an active part (as Dr Chaytor pertinently remarked in reply to a query of mine, 'He would run the genre'). This fact alone throws considerable discredit upon the second theory.

In 1836 F. Wolf produced a new version in his *Altdeutsche Blätter* (I, p. 15). He ascribed the whole conversation to the lady and the knight, leaving nothing to the watchman but the refrain *hu et hu et hu et hu*. Soon after, in 1841, Leroux de Lincy reprinted the poem with a modern French version in his *Recueil de chants historiques français* (I, p. 139). The first five stanzas are treated as a conversation between two watchmen, the knight remaining silent till stanza 6. This theory was adopted by Paul Heyse, *Studia Romanensia* (1852, I, p. 35) and by Jeanroy, *Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France* (Paris, 1889, p. 79; cf. also p. 63). Gaston Paris modified the theory slightly by introducing a friend of the lover in the place of the second watchman ('Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France', *Journal des Savants*, 1892, p. 167).

A new turn was given to the discussion by G. Schlaeger in his *Studien über das Tagelied* (Jena, 1895), on which the preceding summary is largely founded. Schlaeger divides the whole poem, somewhat unequally, between the lady and the knight, not without doing a certain violence to the grammar of the piece. His theory was fully discussed in *Romania*, xxiv, p. 287, by Jeanroy, who had no difficulty in revealing its inherent weaknesses. In particular Schlaeger's interpretation of the constantly repeated *hu et hu* as 'Ausruf des jeweils Redenden zur Bezeichnung der verschiedensten Stimmungen' (*op. cit.*, p. 8) is palpably absurd; the idea of a man trying to express anything at all by the constant repetition of *hu et hu* verges on the ludicrous and prompted Jeanroy to the delicious remark: 'Que dire enfin de ce *hu*! mis lui aussi dans la bouche du chevalier "comme expression (un peu enveloppée, avouons-le) des sentiments les plus variées", et scandant les phrases de ce singulier duo d'amour?' (*loc. cit.*, p. 289).

In 1904 A. Restori (*La Gaite de la Tor*) produced yet another version in which no less than four characters appear: the knight, the lady, the

watchman and the squire or companion of the knight. There is not a single Provençal *alba* in which more than three characters appear (Dr Chaytor kindly verified this fact for me), and among the German *Tagelieder* the only instance of such a large cast which I have been able to discover is the poem by the Burcgräve von Luenz (*DLD*, xxxv, 1). The lady's maid, the watchman, the knight and the lady herself all play a speaking part. Bartsch's remark on this poem is most illuminating (*op cit.*, p. lix): '(Es) unterscheidet sich von den gewöhnlichen (*sc* *Tage*-*liedern*) durch die erzählende Einkleidung.' It is precisely this 'narrative framework' which makes it quite clear who is speaking at any given moment; our poem lacks any such indication whatsoever. This fact alone makes Restori's explanation somewhat improbable, and Jeanroy, who reviewed his book in *Romana*, xxxiii (p. 615), had little difficulty in refuting his tortuous hypothesis. Jeanroy then set forth his own interpretation of the poem, which at least has the merit of simplicity (*loc cit.*, p. 616): 'toute la première partie (vv. 1-55) est prononcée soit par deux guetteurs qui se répondent (probablement d'une tour à l'autre), soit encore par le guetteur et le compagnon de l'amant; le premier prononce les six premiers vers de chaque couplet qu'il fait suivre d'un appel de trompe (ou de cor); le second prononce les vers 8, 9 et 11, qui sont interrompus par un second appel de trompe. Le premier s'adresse tantôt à son "compagnon" (st. I-II), tantôt aux voyageurs qu'il suppose attardés sur le chemin (st. III), tantôt enfin aux amants (st. v); le second lui donne la réplique en lui recommandant le silence—et en faisant allusion à la récompense que leur vaudront leurs bons offices. Les deux derniers couplets appartiennent tout entiers (sauf les deux appels de trompe, bien entendus) à l'amant, auquel seul peuvent convenir les paroles qui y sont prononcées.' (The fourth stanza is not mentioned at all.) This interpretation was approved in the later editions of Bartsch's *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français* (piece 47).

It is not our intention to add further complications to a matter so entangled and confused; rather do we hope to attain a satisfactory solution to the problem by a return to extreme simplicity. Owing to the surprising uniqueness of our poem in the *langue d'oïl* we shall of necessity have recourse to the Provençal *alba* and the German *Tage**lied* to assist our inquiry, but only when the material afforded by the poem itself proves insufficient.

Our interpretation is briefly as follows: the knight approaches the castle in the evening and announces his arrival to his friend the watchman, who allows him to enter (st. I-III). He spends the night in the castle

(st iv-v), but the break of day puts an end to his visit. In the last two stanzas he recalls his recent experiences and accuses the dawn of being hostile towards him.

The last two stanzas present the least difficulty. Jeanroy and Schlaeger, though they differ on many points, agree in assigning lines 56-77 to the lover (Jeanroy, *loc. cit.*, p. 616, Schlaeger, *op. cit.*, p. 6, 'den, unbedingt dem Ritter angehorigen, beiden letzten Strophen'). Restori divided them between the knight and the lady, but there is no strong reason for refusing to assign the whole passage to the knight alone. Lines 56-61 and 74-77 must in any case be given to him and the lament over the coming of the dawn is not infrequently uttered by the man, e.g., *APC*, piece 55.

Doussa res, s'esser podia  
que ia mais alba ni dia  
no fos, grans merces seria,

and in the famous song of Guiraut de Bornelh (*APC*, piece 56).

Bel dos companh, tan soi en ric soïorn  
qu'eu no volgra mais fos alba ni iorn

We may also follow Jeanroy in the interpretation of the *hu et hu* which recurs repeatedly throughout the poem, since his explanation is both simpler and more reasonable than Schlaeger's fanciful suggestion.

*Hu et hu* by no means exhausts the role of the watchman; he is more than a mere instrumentalist. All the critics, with the exception of Wolf, agree in assigning part of the dialogue to him, and in view of the fact that he is thrice addressed by name in the course of the conversation (lines 1, 56 and 77) this is not unreasonable. This supposition becomes almost certain when we consider the prominent part played by the *wahter* in the German *Tagelieder* (e.g. *DLD*, xix, 25, xxii, 1 and 59; xxiii, 1; xxvi, 44; xxxv, 1; xcvi, 305). Is there any need to introduce a third character, or can the whole of the poem be reasonably divided between these two? A closer analysis will reveal the answer.

In lines 1-6 the lover approaches the castle where dwell his lady and her husband, and announces his arrival to his friend the watchman. The *larron* to whom he refers in line 6 is none other than himself, as we shall see in examining stanza iv. There is no need to introduce, with Schlaeger (pp. 6-7), a mysterious 'verdachtige Gestalt' who plays no real part in the action. The watchman replies (lines 8-11) that he has already seen the knight, adding, in jest, that he would almost kill him.

In lines 12-17 the lover gives expression to his fear of the *traitor*. In this case we agree with Schlaeger (*op. cit.*, p. 4) rather than with Jeanroy (*loc. cit.*, p. 616) in assigning them to the lover, although we agree with

Jeanroy in assuming that they are addressed to the watchman and not to the lady (cf Jeanroy's remark on the word *compains*, *loc. cit.*, p. 616). Schlaeger rightly points out (p. 9) that it was a knightly duty 'sich durch den Vortrag eines Liedes angenehm zu machen'. A somewhat similar situation may be found in the poems ascribed to Der von Kurenberc (*DLD*, I, 15):

Ich stuont mir nehtint spâte      an einer zinne,  
dô hört ich einen *ritter*      vil wol *singen*.

Schlaeger also points out (p. 9) that 'die hindernde Angst vor dem *trantor* (hierin haben wir sicher eine Andeutung der *merker* und eines verbotenen Liebesverhältnisses zu erblicken) .am besten auf den Ritter (passt)'. Against the ascription of the lines to the watchman he raises the perfectly valid objection (p. 9): 'Warum sollte sich der Wachter durch seine Angst vor dem *trantor* abhalten lassen, seiner Gewohnheit zu folgen?' (It was of course no unusual thing for the watchman to while away the night with song.) The *trantor* in line 16 (and, as we think, the *seignor* in line 5) must refer to the lady's husband, who is frequently mentioned in the Provençal *albas* as *lo gelos*—e.g., *APC*, piece 53.

Bels dous amïcs, baizem nos yeu e vos  
aval els pratz, on chanto ls auzellos,  
tot o fassam en despieg del gilos.  
oy Dieus, oy Dieus, de l'alba' tan tost ve,

and the poem by Guiraut de Bornelh, quoted above:

Bel dos companh, tan soi en ric soïorn  
qu'eu no volgra mais fos alba ni iorn,  
car la gensor que anc nasques de maire,  
tenc e abras, per qu'eu non prezi gaire  
lo fol gelos ni l'alba

The watchman replies (lines 18–22) with the refrain of the first verse which, it should be noted, does not appear in the manuscript but has been added by the editors.

In the third stanza (lines 23–25) the lover confesses that he is uneasy, as he might well be in the circumstances. Whether line 25 means that he would like to sleep alone outside the castle, or inside not alone, cannot be determined. Schlaeger (p. 10) takes it to mean that the man is getting cold feet and wants to go home—a most unusual frame of mind in which to find the knightly hero of an *aubade*. The second hypothesis would be more in keeping with the normal situation, e.g., *DLD*, xxxv, 15:

Daz bin ich der der minne gert.

Jeanroy (*loc. cit.*, p. 289) rightly rejects Schlaeger's hypothesis as being quite out of harmony with the whole spirit of chivalry and courtesy. Even in those days faint heart never won fair lady!

The watchman seeks to encourage his friend and gives him permission to enter (lines 26–28). There is no need to introduce any hypothetically belated travellers to explain lines 27 and 28—it is just as reasonable for the watchman to address them to the knight as to ‘les voyageurs qu’il suppose attardés sur le chemin’ (Jeanroy, *loc cit.*, p. 616). Heartened by these words the lover finally enters the castle and begs his friend to remain silent (lines 30–33).

Schlaeger points out (p. 7) that stanza III need not necessarily take place in the lady’s chamber, although he places lines 26–28 and 32–33 in the mouth of the lady herself. To her he also assigns most of stanzas IV and V (p. 5). Stanza IV is certainly difficult, and lines 37–38 are particularly obscure. Schlaeger (p. 10) proposed to read *tor* for *flor* in line 37 and interpreted *covertor* as meaning the coverlet of the lady’s bed. This seems credible and fully in keeping with the context, although the suggested emendation is not really necessary, as Schlaeger half admits (p. 11). This interpretation of an admittedly difficult passage is considerably strengthened by a striking parallel from an anonymous German *Tagelied* (DLD, xcviii, 305):

(*The watchman sings*) Swer nu verholne lige,  
der sol vil balde entwichen,  
du naht ein ende hât.

There is good reason to connect the *robeor* of line 35 with the *larron* of line 6—in allusion to the lover’s opening words the watchman replies that he can only see one *robeor* and he is in bed with the lady of the castle. Schlaeger (p. 10) quotes from Bartsch, *Chrestomathie provençale* (3rd ed., 228, 3) an interesting parallel to the meaning of *larron* in this particular context:

Dins ma chambr’ encortinada  
fon el a larron.

We might add a similar instance from the German *Tagelied* (DLD, xxiii, 27), the lady of the castle, wishing to gain the connivance of the watchman at the entry of her lover, addresses him thus:

... Wahter liebe,  
hîlf mir in fristen  
mit dinen kluogen wol verholnen listen.  
wirt sant mir zemem *diebe*.

After this speech of the watchman (lines 34–39) comes the refrain of the preceding verse, which again is not in the manuscript but which was probably indicated by the opening half-line *hu et hu* (lines 40–44).

In stanza V the watchman addresses the two lovers and assures them that they are safe till dawn (lines 45–50), again the lover replies with the

refrain of the previous verse. Then come the last two stanzas which, as we have already seen, belong to the lover alone, except for the *hu et hu*.

Jeanroy (*loc. cit.*, p. 616) expressed surprise at the idea of a conversation between the persons inside the chamber and those outside: 'Quelle idée étrange, au reste, serait celle de nous montrer les amants et leurs deux partenaires (he is here thinking more particularly of Restori's theory) passant la nuit à dialoguer et à s'envoyer, de la "chambre coie" à l'extérieur, des répliques totalement dénuées d'à-propos!' Yet the same situation occurs in the *alba* of Guiraut de Bornelh and not infrequently in the German *Tageheder* (*DLD*, xix, 25, xxii, 1; xcvi, 305).

One point which lends weight to our suggested distribution of the poem and in particular to the tripartite division of stanza III is the variation in the refrain. The refrain in the first two stanzas is the same and belongs in each to the watchman. In stanzas III, IV and V a new refrain appears, each time in the mouth of the lover. Apart from the continual *hu et hu* the last two stanzas have no proper refrain. Some of the Provençal *albas* and the German *Tageheder* preserve the same refrain throughout the whole poem, e.g., each verse of the poem beginning

En un vergier sotz fuella d'albespi

(*APC*, piece 53) ends with the line

Oy Dieus, oy Dieus, de l'alba' tan tost ve.

and the poem beginning

Us cavaliers si iazia

(*APC*, piece 55) also preserves the same refrain from beginning to end. Among the *Tageheder* the best-known example of this feature is probably the lovely poem by Hemrich von Mörungen (*DLD*, xiv, 341)

Owê, sol aber mir iemer mê  
geluhten dur die naht  
noch wizer danne ein snê  
ir lîp vl wol geslaht?..

where every verse has the refrain

dô tagete ez.

A more exact parallel to the change of refrain which we have noted in our *aubade* is found in the *alba* of Guiraut de Bornelh to which we referred above; here the first six verses, spoken by the watcher outside the castle, end with the line

et ades sera l'alba

while the last verse of all, spoken by the lover himself, from within, ends

lo fol gelos m l'alba

Furthermore, in our interpretation, the word *compains* is in every case used by the lover in addressing the watchman (lines 14, 23, 31, 42, 53). According to Schlaeger's explanation (pp. 4-5) it was used, presumably as a term of endearment, by the lover in addressing his lady, and, according to Restori, by the lady in addressing her lover. Jeanroy did not fail to point out (*loc. cit.*, p. 616) that the lady could not address either the watchman or her lover as *compains*. 'le terme serait bien peu tendre pour l'un, trop familier pour l'autre.' Jeanroy's further objection, that if the command to remain silent were given to the watchman by the lady it would not have to be repeated three times, is on the other hand somewhat absurd. The refrain is a difficult poetical device to handle and it is not fair to the poet to examine its meaning too closely. In stanza II, for instance, the *l'* in line 19 must refer to the *larron* of line 6, it cannot refer to the *traitor* of line 16, who is a *sejor* within the castle. Nor can we agree with Jeanroy (*loc. cit.*, p. 616) that 'au moment où la pièce débute, l'entrevue est commencée'. (He takes *seignor* in line 5 to refer to the lover himself, which leaves the identity of the *larron* unsolved). In this connection Schlaeger (p. 6) seems to be right in considering the first two stanzas as a prologue to the actual meeting of the lovers in stanza IV. Finally we cannot agree with Jeanroy's double interpretation of the word *jore*. In line 50 (and in line 64) one meaning and one only is possible, and it is not the meaning which Jeanroy gives to the word in lines 33, 44 and 55, viz. 'la récompense que leur vaudront leurs bons offices' (sc. aux deux guetteurs). Jeanroy does not produce a scrap of evidence to justify his very free rendering of the word *jore*; in any case it would be rather surprising if the same word had two such different meanings in the course of 77 lines.

Most of the previous explanations of *Gaite de la tor* have suffered from excessive subtlety and unnecessary complications, to which was added a regrettable failure to take into account the dawn-songs in other languages. Whatever the demerits of our own interpretation it has at least the salient virtue of simplicity which characterises both the *Tagelied* of Germany and the *alba* of Provence.

H. G. BURTON

## GERMAN GRAMMARS IN ENGLAND IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE Library of the University of St Andrews possesses a considerable number of German grammars and readers published in England between the years 1774 and 1837. These were not purchased by the Library for the use of students studying German in St Andrews, as German was not one of the subjects taught in the University at that time, but they were obtained under the Copyright Act, by which the University of St Andrews had the right to one copy of every work published in this country. In 1837 this right was commuted for an annual grant, so that the Library has no grammars published after that date except those obtained quite recently.

The following list is not intended to be exhaustive, but it does contain all that is of importance. The place of publication, unless otherwise stated, is London.

(1) Wendeborn, A. *The Elements of German Grammar*, 1774. This grammar was evidently extensively used, as it appeared in an 11th edition in 1849. Wendeborn was the Minister of the German Chapel on Ludgate Hill.

(2) Render, W. *A Practical Grammar of the German Language*, 1799.

(3) Noehden, G. H. *A Grammar of the German Language*, 1800. In the following article this is quoted from the 2nd edition of 1807. This was the most popular grammar of the period. An 8th edition appeared in 1838.

(4) Fischer, J. J. G. *A New Classification of the Nouns Substantive in the German Language*, 1819.

(5) Jehring, E. *A Grammar of the German Language*, Glasgow, 1820. This appears to be the first German Grammar published in Scotland. Jehring was a Lieutenant in the York Light Infantry, resident in Glasgow.

(6) Boileau, D. *The Nature and Genus of the German Language*, 1820. This is not a formal grammar but deals more with questions of German style by means of quotations from contemporary authors.

(7) Rowbotham, J. *A Practical German Grammar*, 1824.

(8) Becker, C. F. *A Grammar of the German Language*, 1830. This is an adaptation of the author's *Deutsche Grammatik*, Frankfurt, 1829. It is not intended for beginners, and even the advanced student must have



found Becker's terminology difficult, if he were not philosophically minded.

(9) Skene, P. O. *An Elementary German Grammar*, 1831.

(10) Klattowsky, W. G. *Deutsches Handbuch*, 2 vols, 1831. The first volume contains extracts from German authors followed by a grammar written in German. Vol. II opens with a short grammar in English and French which is followed by German extracts with an interlinear translation in English and French.

(11) Bernays, A. *A Compendious German Grammar*, 1833. Bernays was Professor of German in King's College, London.

(12) Bramsen, J. *A Guide to the German Language*, 1834.

(13) Tiarks, J. G. *A Practical Grammar of the German Language*, 1834. Tiarks was minister of the German Protestant Church in London

(14) Troppaneger, A. *The Grammatical Forms of the German Language*, 1836.

There were, of course, other grammars of German earlier than those in the above list, but they were only isolated attempts. A real tradition of German grammar did not develop until the early nineteenth century when interest in German literature was aroused by the Romantics. The grammars earlier than 1774 will be dealt with elsewhere.

Apart from the question of their educational value these grammars have a certain interest to the philologist. The majority of the authors were Germans resident in this country, and the systems of grammar which they use are largely derived from German authorities of the eighteenth century, and as some of the grammars, quoted above, remained unchanged in their later editions until about 1860, it appears that the type of German grammar presented to English students was at that time almost a century old. It would, of course, be an idle task to attempt to determine the sources of a modern German grammar, as the system of presenting German is to-day traditional and fixed, but in the eighteenth century, when many original and independent systems of grammar were advocated, it is possible to trace the influence of one grammarian on another. Also in these grammars one can observe the rise of certain practices which are inherited in the school grammars of to-day. Summing up the results of the following investigation, it might be said now that the earliest grammar of the series, Wendeborn's, is an abridgement of Gottsched's *Grundlegung einer deutschen Sprachkunst*, 1748. Rander in 1799 is independent in his presentation of the noun, but the section on the verb simply repeats Wendeborn. This is seen particularly in the treatment of the compound verb. With all these verbs to choose from, both give a

paradigm of *aufhalten* and both make the same mistake of giving the past as *ich hette auf*. Other similarities will be observed later. In Noehden's grammar (1800), which was the most important and most influential grammar published in this period, the influence of Adelung's *Umständliches Lehrgebäude der deutschen Sprache* (1782) is unmistakable. Noehden is, however, no slavish follower of Adelung. He often quotes his authority in an attempt to refute him. It was through this grammar, which is quoted with respect by later grammarians, and also through George Crabb's translation of Adelung's *Deutsche Sprachlehre*, made in 1799, that Adelung's system of German grammar became known in this country. The Adelung-Noehden tradition is continued by many later grammarians, Rowbotham, Bramsen, Troppaneger and Tiarks, although the last named is also obviously influenced by Becker. The antecedents of Jehring's work are difficult to determine, and it would be risky to attribute Jehring's many mistakes and inaccuracies to any reputable German grammarian. Klattowsky's grammar stands somewhat aside from the Adelung tradition. It is a slavish copy of a German grammar, which was used extensively in German schools in the nineteenth century, namely Heyse's *Kleine theoretisch-praktische deutsche Grammatik* (1816). Incidentally this grammar was also used by later grammarians. Whitney, for example, in 1869 acknowledges his indebtedness to it. One example for many might show how closely Klattowsky follows his authority.

From the chapter on versification, Heyse (5th ed.), p. 329.

Anmerk Man halte nicht Rhythmus und Metrum für gleichbedeutend. Ein Rhythmus kann durch verschiedene Metra ausgedrückt werden. So haben z. B. folgende verschiedene Metra offenbar einerlei Rhythmus:

Leb wohl, | mein Freund'

Wie er spricht, | so geschieht's

Umgekehrt kann ein und dasselbe Metrum verschiedenen Rhythmus haben. Die

Wörter frohlockt und Vollmond haben einerlei Metrum, aber verschiedenen Rhythmus; denn in dem ersten Metrum ist die Hebung auf der letzten der beiden Langen, in dem zweiten Metrum auf der ersten.

Klattowsky (p. 500):

Anmerk Man halte nicht Rhythmus und Metrum für gleichbedeutend. Folgende verschiedene Metra haben z. B. einerlei Rhythmus:

Leb wohl, | mein Freund'

Wie er spricht, | so geschieht's.

Umgekehrt kann ein und dasselbe Metrum verschiedenen Rhythmus haben Die Wörter fröhlockt und Völlmōnd haben einerlei Metrum aber verschiedenen Rhythmus, denn in frohlockt ist die Hebung auf der letzten Länge, in Vollmond auf der ersten

Up to 1830 there is no trace in these German grammars of the influence of Jakob Grimm or of other German philologists, and even after that date the older grammars were still the more popular. Tiarks, for example, was re-edited in 1863. The first grammar, in which use is made of the results of recent philological research in Germany, is Becker's, but to a certain extent the philological bias of this and other grammars was not beneficial. This is seen particularly in Becker's attempt to class the German strong verbs according to the original vowel of the infinitive Becker's grammar never seems to have been very popular, but it influenced certain others, such as Skene, Bernays and to a lesser degree Tiarks.

Before investigating the grammatical systems, it might be interesting to see what the grammarians say about the history of German. The subject does not really concern the modern grammarian and few of them consider it at all. Noehden, however, gives some details on the history of German, in which he follows Adelung closely, and also on the question of standard German, in which, as a Hanoverian, he differs from Adelung, who claimed that Upper Saxon was the most correct of the German dialects. Noehden remarks that there were at the time of the Reformation three divisions of German: Upper German, Low German and High German. The latter goes back to the dialect of Saxony, which in the tenth century was colonised by Franconians, and through mixture with the original Slav inhabitants much of the original roughness of Upper German was worn away. This idea of mixture with the Slavs affecting the character of High German is taken from Adelung (*U.L.* I, p. 81). After considering the influence of Luther, he passes on to the question of standard German, and objects to Adelung's identification of standard German with Upper Saxon. What is correct is determined by 'rules of analogy and general grammar', which are superior to any local custom. Noehden admits that Upper Saxon was originally the best type of German, but High German has spread to other people such as the Lower Saxons, 'who from the favourable disposition of their organs of speech were better able to follow the dictates of general rule and analogy'. Lower Saxon is in general more correct than Upper Saxon, although neither is perfect. Noehden then quotes some of the peculiarities of Upper Saxon which are to be rejected, e.g., the confusion of *b, d, g* and *p, t, k*; the pronunciation of *sp* and *st* as *shp* and *shst*; the confusion between *u* and *ι*. These are faulty because the orthography is not followed. Lower Saxon too has its faults: the pronun-

ciation of *t* as *d* in Anlaut; of *schm* and *schl* as *sn* and *sl*, and of *g* as *j*. Noehden's principle is that that pronunciation is best which approximates most closely to the spelling. Later in the chapter on orthography Noehden says that in cases where the spelling is doubtful 'those characters should be used which approach the nearest to the best pronunciation'. He is not unaware of the contradiction but does not succeed in explaining it away satisfactorily. The other grammarians have very little to say about the history of German. Boileau remarks that the affinity of German with Greek and Persian seems to point to a common Scythian origin. Klattowsky too touches on the resemblance between German and Persian and quotes Voss' opinion, that Greek is derived from German. He also mentions Gothic as 'the mother of Franconian, Saxonian and the Northern languages'. More modern views are reached in Becker. He gives a correct account of the origins of German but repeats the older view of Adelung that the German dialects fall into two groups, Low German and Upper German, and that High German was formed by a combination of the two.

#### THE DIVISIONS OF THE GRAMMARS.

The material of German grammars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was divided according to the practice of the Latin grammarians into Orthographia, Etymologica, and Syntax. The first division contained, in addition to the spelling and pronunciation, chapters on the length and division of syllables and versification. The second dealt with the parts of speech and their use. In the English grammars the section on versification is usually omitted as not being the proper business of the grammarian. It is dealt with in its traditional place by Noehden only. Tiarks puts it under syntax, whilst Klattowsky places it in an appendix. Few of the grammars under consideration retain the traditional titles of the sections of their grammars, although the order of treatment remains the same down to the modern grammars. Jehring alone keeps the headings orthography, etymology and syntax. Becker, Tiarks and Bernays have two divisions, etymology and syntax, the pronunciation being included under the first. The others have a chapter headed syntax, whilst the remainder of the material has no comprehensive title. The etymology is divided according to the parts of speech. Of these the early grammarians distinguished nine, which were divided into three classes: (i) *nomen* (including substantive, adjective), article and pronoun; (ii) *verb* and participles; (iii) *particles* (including adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection). This older division is found in Wendeborn and Render. The

majority, following Adelung, omit the participles as a separate part of speech and divide the nomen into substantive and adjective, the numerals being considered as adjectives. In addition to the declensions and conjugations the etymology also deals with the use of the various parts of speech, and in the early grammars much was treated here which properly belongs to syntax. For instance, the use of the subjunctive was dealt with under the heading 'conjunctions'. In Jehring's grammar so much was considered as belonging to the etymology that only the order of words was left for the syntax.

Adelung's division of the syntax is typical and forms the traditional basis of the modern school grammar. It is divided into three sections: (i) *Von der Verbindung einzelner Wörter mit einander*; (ii) *Von der Folge der Wörter*; (iii) *Von den Sätzen*. This division is found in all its details in Noehden. The first section is divided according to the parts of speech, a division which is practical, but which prevents any proper treatment of the theory of cases. Becker had an original division of the syntax which has not been without effect on modern grammarians. The subject is divided into five chapters: (i) Syntax of the Predicative Combination; (ii) Syntax of the Attributive Combination; (iii) Syntax of the Objective Combination, (iv) Syntax of Compound Sentences; (v) Construction (order of words). The first three chapters are subdivided into 'notional relations', such as the relation of causality and the factitive relation. This division is hardly practical enough for the school grammar. Its effect is, however, seen in Bernays, who has the conventional division into parts of speech, followed by two very confused chapters on the ablative and factitive relations, in which the definitions and examples are taken from Becker. Under factitive relation are considered certain prepositions and cases used to denote the effect or purpose of an action, such as *bitten um*, *forschen nach*, *werden zu*, etc.

#### THE PRONUNCIATION AND SPELLING.

The details on the pronunciation of German are in all the grammars, except Noehden's, very faulty. The method used was the conventional one of giving English sounds similar to the German, and the many inaccuracies may be due to the faulty English of the authors, most of whom were Germans. The type of German recommended is in all cases, with the exception of Rendar, North German.

Wendeborn is most inaccurate. It is stated that *c* is to be pronounced as in *circle*, *i* in *Inhalt* and *immer* as the *ea* of *eat* and the *ee* of *eel*, *s* as in

*singer* and *six*, *w* as in *willow*, *y* in *seyn* as the *ea* of *eagle*, *z* as in *zone*. The pronunciation of *ch* and the modified vowels is not mentioned. Wendeborn and many after him retain the original designation of the modified vowels as diphthongs, whilst *au* is called a triphthong. Wendeborn has nothing on the spelling.

Render is the only one of these grammarians who recommends a pronunciation which is clearly Upper Saxon. *s* before all consonants is to be pronounced *sh*, example *Sklavery*, *o* as the *a* of *care*, *u* as *e* in *evl*, *au* and *eu* as the *i* of *fire*. The modified vowels are still called diphthongs. German spelling is so confused that it is impossible to lay down any rules for it.

Jehring recommends an extreme type of North German. *g* is to be pronounced as *ch* before all front vowels, *sp* and *st* as written, *s* as in the English *so*, *b* between vowels as *v*. Jehring distinguishes two pronunciations of the long *e* in *Leere* and *Meer*, but does not say what the difference is.

Noehden devotes thirty-eight pages to the pronunciation and spelling. He distinguishes clearly between the various *e* sounds. (*a*) broad or open sound as in *fate* and *name*, used in open syllable and in other words as *Bret*, *der*, *Erde*. He criticises the Upper Saxon pronunciation of the open sound before an *h* as in *dehnen*, *Fehde*; (*b*) the acute or closed sound (as French *é*), which is used before *h* and *th* (because this stands for *ht*) and when doubled. This sound is pronounced open in Upper Saxon which is incorrect; (*c*) before a consonant in the same syllable the sound is called slender, as in *Bett*; (*d*) the obscure sound at the end of a word and in the prefixes and suffixes. In the section on the consonants Noehden warns against the confusion between *b*, *d*, *g* and *p*, *t*, *k*, and discusses the various pronunciations of *g* in German, recommending that it should be pronounced as a stop. *sp* and *st* are to be pronounced as written, and the Upper Saxon pronunciation as *shp* and *sht* 'should be more considered as an unwelcome intruder than a desirable guest'. Noehden correctly distinguishes between the various pronunciations of *s* and *ch*, but, despite Adelung, still calls the modified vowels diphthongs. There are, according to Noehden, three principles by which one can determine the correct spelling of a German word: (*a*) one should use those characters which approach most closely to the best pronunciation, (*b*) regard must be had to etymology, (*c*) one should not deviate from the general practice. These remarks are a repetition of Adelung's from the *U L.* p. 68. Noehden does not go into the details of spelling except to object to Adelung's explanation of the *th* as a variation of *t*, of which the *h* was later put before the

consonant and became a sign of the length of the vowel. Noehden holds that the *h* was originally a *ch* and that *thun* goes back to *tuhen* and ultimately to *tuchen*.

Rowbotham recommends the spirantal pronunciation of *g* after vowels and the pronunciation of *sp* and *st* as in English. The long *e* is to be pronounced as *a* in *name* and *fate*. (Incidentally these two examples first found in Noehden are the only two to be found in many a recent school grammar.) The modified vowels are still called diphthongs. The section on the spelling contains only remarks on the use of capitals and the *ss* and *sz*.

Becker pays little attention to the difficulties of foreigners. His remarks are very similar to Noehden's, but he has confused Noehden's account with a little false philology. On the pronunciation of the *e* sounds he says that *e* is broad and open as in *name* and *fate*, when it is derived from an original *a*. The examples are *Herz*, *Schmerz*, *letzt* and the infinitive termination *-en*. It is an acute sound as in the French *fermé*, when it is derived from an *i*. Examples *leben* from the Gothic *liban* and *geben* from *giban*. Becker has some remarks on the quantity of vowels but nothing on the spelling. He was the first to use the terms Umlaut or modified vowels, and is followed in this by all those who do not slavishly follow Noehden (as Bramsen and Troppaneger). Klattowsky has a few remarks on the pronunciation of the *e* sounds, which are a repetition of Noehden, and recommends the spirantal pronunciation of *g* after vowels and the *sp* and *st* as in English. Bramsen and Troppaneger give a very abbreviated version of Noehden. Tiarks and Bernays repeat exactly Noehden's rules on the pronunciation of the *e* sounds, and Tiarks adds also from Noehden some remarks on deviations from the Hanoverian standard. Both say that the pronunciation of *sp* and *st* as *shp* and *sht* should be carefully avoided, Bernays remarking that this pronunciation is on the decline.

#### THE NOUN.

The earlier German grammarians devoted much ingenuity to the proper division of the declensions of the noun. In the seventeenth century most grammarians divided the nouns according to the ending of the genitive singular and thus arrived at three declensions. This older system was overthrown by Gottsched, who considered the formation of the plural as decisive and attempted to force the various plural forms into five classes corresponding to the five declensions of Latin. Even as late as 1820 we find the old three-declension system in Jehring. The three classes are. (i) all feminines and weak masculines, (ii) masculines and

neuters ending in *-el*, *-en*, *-er*, (iii) all other masculines and neuters. The division is so faulty that criticism is hardly necessary. The first class contains both strong and weak nouns, whilst the third is a motley collection containing plurals in *-e* and *-er*. Some of the mixed masculines, such as *Vetter* and *Bauer*, come in the second class, others as *Staat*, *Strahl* and *Mond* in the third. Jehring's account of the nouns concludes with a section on words with a double plural, in which the plural of *das Band* is given as *dre Banden*, the word *Nest* according to Jehring has two plurals, *Nester*, meaning 'places of prey', and *Neste*, 'nests'

Wendeborn follows Gottsched in all details. He distinguishes five declensions (i) nouns with plural same as the singular. In this class are included *Mutter* and *Tochter*, which according to Wendeborn are the same in both numbers (ii) Nouns which add *-e* in the plural. This class includes nouns of all three genders (iii) Nouns adding *-en* to form the plural. The types given are *Brunn*, *Freiheit*, *Ohr* (iv) Nouns adding *-n* in the plural. Types *Wachtel* and *Feder*. (v) The plurals in *-er*. Like Gottsched Wendeborn does not mention the neuter collectives in *-e*, or the group *Name*, *Glaube*, etc., which are evidently declined like the weak masculine. Of the mixed masculine only *Sphitter*, *Ungar* and *Tartar* are noted and included under (iv). Like Gottsched Wendeborn quotes each time a vocative case: e.g., *o ihr Ohren!* Gottsched's division is obviously faulty. The distinction between (iii) and (iv) is unnecessary, whilst (iii) is a mixture of various declensions. This system called forth considerable criticism in Germany and was rejected in favour of Adelung's. Adelung attempted to take into consideration both the endings of the genitive singular and the plural and arrived at a system of eight declensions. The only English grammarian to adopt Adelung's classification was Boileau, and even he admitted that it was unsatisfactory. The eight classes quoted by Boileau are (i) plural in *-e*, (ii) plural in *-er*, (iii) plural same as singular, (iv) genitive singular and plural in *-en*, (v) genitive singular *-ens*, plural *-en*, (vi) genitive singular *-es*, plural *-en*, (vii) no change in singular, plural in *-en*, (viii) no change in singular, plural in *-e*. Boileau adds also from Adelung a number of nouns which have two plurals, one in *-e* and the other in *-er*. The difference between the two is, that the plural in *-er* denotes individual objects, whilst the other has a more general significance. For instance *die Dorner* denotes the single thorns, whilst *die Dorne* means the thorns in general. The system of declensions which was most popular in England was Noehden's, which seems to have been arrived at by running each two of Adelung's classes into one. Noehden has therefore four classes distinguished by the ending of the genitive



singular: (i) all feminines, (ii) masculines and neuters ending in *-el*, *-en*, *-er*, and the diminutives and collectives; (iii) masculine nouns with the genitive singular in *-en*; this class also includes the group *Friede*, *Name*, etc., (iv) all other masculines and neuters. Despite its popularity this system is no better than those which preceded it. The fourth class contains two distinct types of nouns which should be distinguished. The mixed masculines are included under (iii) or (iv) according as their genitive singular ended in *-s* or *-es*. The account closes with a list of double plurals, in which is found again *die Banden* as the plural of *das Band*; Adelung's distinction between the plurals in *-e* and *-er* is also quoted. *Das Ende* and *der Anfang*, we are told, have no plural, although earlier *das Ende* was given as a noun of the second declension. Noehden's classification was adopted in its entirety by Klattowsky, Bramsen and Troppaneger. Tarks makes a slight modification which is not an improvement. He puts the neuter collectives in *-e* quite wrongly under (iv). Even later Noehden's system did not die down. It is found, for example, in L. Muller's *Practical Grammar of the German Language* (1858). Rowbotham (1824) has a modification of the five-declension system which is more satisfactory than Noehden's: (i) plural same as singular, (ii) plural in *-e*, (iii) weak masculines and feminines, (iv) mixed masculines and neuters, (v) plural in *-er*.

The question of the proper classification of the nouns was considered so important that Fischer (1819) devoted a pamphlet to it. He claims that his system is an improvement on Adelung's, 'neither hastily nor unthinkingly made'. Fischer finds that there are ten natural variations of the German noun. His ten types are *Himmel*, *Vater*, *Bauer*, *Mahl*, *Pfahl*, *Brett*, *Mann*, *Strahl*, *Rabe*, *Graf*. It is obvious that several unnecessary divisions are made, but a more serious defect is the complete omission of the feminines. The author then adds a vocabulary of 'exceptions' which cannot be formed from his rules. This runs to 50 pages and includes some 6000 nouns. It begins most ambitiously, including even the compounds of the types, but the author's patience seems to have become exhausted towards the end where the list becomes extremely scanty. Many peculiar words are included, some of which are dialectal, others obsolete, such as *fist*, *geytan*, *lahn*, *mespelbaum*, *pasch*, *petz*, *schorl*, *stahr*, *vech*, *wau*. One of the exceptions is the word *Vater* which was one of the original ten types.

With Becker's grammar traces of Grimm's work are seen for the first time. He divides the nouns into the 'ancient' and 'modern' declensions, corresponding to our strong and weak. In this he was followed by Skene

and Bernays. It is noticeable that none of the grammarians of the period use the terms strong and weak, and even later the terms 'ancient' and 'modern' or 'old' and 'new' are considered preferable (e.g., Whitney).

Lastly Render's original theory, which was greeted with derision by other grammarians, might be considered. Render attempted to distinguish between declension and plurality, holding that the plural endings had nothing to do with the declensions. There is accordingly only one declension in German, and 'that very simple'. The declension is, that -s is added to the genitive singular of masculine and neuter nouns. Render is, however, reduced to giving the usual lists of plural endings. This theory had a curious revival in Keane's *True Theory of the German Declensions and Conjugations* (1873). Keane polemises against Noehden and Tiarks and proposes 'to make a clean sweep of nominal declension and verbal conjugation'. The plural endings are of no account, since the notion of plurality does not belong to that of declension. Of the two inflections of the genitive singular -en is not a true case ending since it is found in the plural, and we are therefore left with one declension, the genitive singular in -s. The author then gives lists of the usual types and the usual exceptions, so that the whole matter seems to be a quibble over words. The *True Theory* has nothing new to offer. Interesting amongst Keane's remarks is the observation that feminine nouns should not have Umlaut, since Umlaut is a sign of strength.

As there was originally no difference between the declension of the common and the proper nouns, the early grammarians did not deal with the subject of the declension of proper nouns. Even Gottsched and with him Wendeborn ignore it, except to mention in the syntax the use of the article with the proper noun. As late as 1824 Rowbotham does not discuss the subject. The others attempt to divide the proper nouns into the same number of classes as the common nouns. Noehden, for example, has four classes with the plural endings the same as the common nouns. Tiarks is the first to mention the plural in -s and to remark that the dative and accusative singular in -en is obsolete. Fischer (1819) recommends a plural in -ens in *Moses, Kluge, Priestley, Bayley*. Incidentally he gives English students the information, that the last syllable of *Priestley* and *Bayley* is to be pronounced like the South German diminutive ending -le.

Following the model of the Latin grammars the German grammarians divided the rules of gender into (a) *regulae generales*, which are rules derived from the meaning of the nouns, (b) *regulae speciales*, which are rules from the endings. These two divisions are still found in the modern grammars. In the latter group are included the last consonant of the

word together with the preceding vowel, regardless of whether these two letters were part of the root or not, e.g., under *-ung* *Sprung* and *Regierung* are quoted. This list was usually arranged alphabetically according to the last letter. This is the system used by Wendeborn, all of the examples being taken from Gottsched. For instance, Wendeborn says that words in *-ung* are feminine except *Sprung* and *Ursprung* which are the two exceptions quoted by Gottsched. Words in *-el* and *-er* are masculine except as in Gottsched *Exempel*, *Siegel*, *Segel*, *Rathsel*, *Wasser*, a list which is far from complete. Jehring is most unsatisfactory on this question. He gives some general rules without giving the German words. Feminine, he says, are the goddesses and all females except wife and wench. Quite incorrect is the statement that the names of rivers are feminine except those ending in *-gau*, *-el* and *-er*. Render is even more confusing. His general rules are rules from endings, his special rules rules from the meaning. As a general rule he says that words ending in consonants are masculine, and gives a list of exceptions which includes such endings as *-gend*, *-uld*, *-ust*, *-axt*. He has too a 'common gender' which appears to include words of double gender. Amongst these we find *der* or *das Gefallen*, *die* or *das Geheimnis*. We are told, too, that some words admit 'either of the Masculine or the Neuter which is an advantage in the language'.

Adelung dispensed with the two groups of the rules of gender and the long list of terminations. His account is repeated in all its details by Noehden and with a few modifications by all other grammarians until modern times. According to Noehden masculine are the male names, God, angels and demons, the winds, seasons, months and days. God, angels and demons have disappeared from the modern grammar, but the others still remain, although the winds and days come under the rule that the gender of a compound is determined by its second part. Masculine too are words ending in *-ing*, *-ling*, *-er* and *-en*. To this Noehden gives a list of exceptions which is identical with Adelung's. There are, for instance, seven words ending in *-en* which are neuter, *Almosen*, *Becken*, *Eisen*, *Kissen*, *Lehen*, *Wappen*, *Zeichen*. Like Adelung Noehden includes *Eisen* in this list, although it is covered by the rule that metals are neuter. Feminine are the names of females, fruits, flowers and rivers and words with the suffixes *-ey*, *-heit*, *-keit*, *-schaft*, *-ucht*, *-uft*, *-ung*, the abstracts in *-e* and some words ending in *-nis*. Although the number of suffixes is considerably reduced as compared with Gottsched, a few as *-ucht* and *-uft* are still wrongly included, and *Sprung* and *Ursprung* are still mentioned among the exceptions. Neuter are the names of metals except

*Stahl* and *Tombach*, countries, infinitives, diminutives, collectives with the prefix *ge-*, and words not really substantives. These details are repeated by all other grammarians of the period.

#### THE ADJECTIVE.

The treatment of the adjective shows little variation. All the grammarians before 1830 give the genitive singular masculine and neuter as ending in *-es*, and after that date Tiarks still repeats it from Noehden. The early grammarians Wendeborn, Render and Jehring do not give any information on the declension of the adjective after the possessives and *kein*. Wendeborn and Gottsched repeat Gottsched's remark that the correct form is *die grossen Manner* and not *die grosse Manner* as was used in South German. Wendeborn shows, too, traces of Gottsched's theory, that the endings of the adjective are the forms of the definite article attached to the end of the adjective in his remark 'the last letter of the article becomes the last of the adjective'.

All the grammarians of the period give as a general rule that if two adjectives qualify the same noun in the oblique cases, the second must be used in the weak form. Jehring, Rowbotham and Bernays, following the East Middle German usage, state that if an adjective ends in *-m*, the ending *-en* must be used instead of *-em*, e.g., *lahmen* not *lahmem*.

The comparison of the adjective offers little material for discussion. In the early grammars there is some indecision as to what should be included under this head. Wendeborn, following Gottsched, includes such compounds as *sternalt*, *blutarm*, and phrases as *unglaublich schon* as superlatives. The early grammarians give both endings of the superlative *-st* and *-est*, but no information on their respective use (e.g., Wendeborn, Jehring, Render, Bramsen, Rowbotham). All of them give a list of irregular forms. Jehring, for example, has *besser*, *besserer* (still better), *beste*; *sehr*, *heftiger*, *heftigsten*, whilst Render has *bos*, *schlimmer*, *schlimmst*, Rowbotham *ubel*, *schlimmer*, *schlimmst*. Becker and Tiarks repeat Adelung's statement that *mindest* is the superlative of *min*, and *mehr* the comparative of *meh*.

#### THE PRONOUN.

The main point of interest in the treatment of the pronoun is the division of the material and the use of the various forms of address. The division of the German pronouns goes back to Gottsched who distinguished six classes: *personliche*, *zueignende*, *anzeigende*, *fragende*, *beziehende* and *uneigentliche*. The last class is usually called the improper

pronouns by the English grammarians and includes such words as *man*, *einer*, *keiner*, *jemand*, etc. This system is adopted by Wendeborn and Rowbotham. Jehring added a quite unnecessary division which he called the responsive pronoun, used in answer to a question and which includes either personal or demonstrative pronouns. To these six groups Adelung added another, called the determinative pronoun, including *derjenige*, *dasselbe*, and this is adopted by all other grammarians of the period except Render. The latter has an original division arrived at by dividing Gottsched's improper pronouns into three groups, (i) numerical pronouns (*ein*, *kein*, *der einzige*), (ii) indefinites (*der eine*, *der andere*, *jemand*), (iii) invariables or adverbs (*selbst*, *selber*, *nichts*, *einerley*, *hunderterley*). All the grammarians have a note on the forms of address, giving *Er* and *Sie* (singular) as the correct form of address to servants. With regard to the relative pronoun Jehring attempts to distinguish between *der* and *welcher*, stating that *welcher* refers to a person who is near, *der* to one who is distant, e.g. *Dieses ist mein Neffe, welcher aus Frankreich zurückkam*, but *Ich schreibe an meinen Neffen, der in Frankreich ist*. All the grammarians before Tiarks recommend the use of *welcher* and not *der* when the antecedent is a personal pronoun.

#### THE ADVERB.

The treatment of the adverb calls for little comment. The usual practice was to divide the adverbs into semantic groups. Klattowsky is, however, interesting, as he repeats from the early editions of Heyse Adelung's peculiar theory of the adverb. According to Adelung and Klattowsky there are two types of adverbs, *Beschaffenheitswörter*, which denote a quality possessed by the subject of the sentence (e.g. *der Mann ist gut*) and *Umstandswörter* which add a quality to the subject (e.g., *Der Mann ist hier*). The adverb is therefore the more original form of speech than the adjective which is formed from the adverb by a process which Adelung and Klattowsky call 'Concretion'. The first type of adverbs are 'concretisiert' by the addition of *-e*, e.g., *gut*, *gute*. The definite article is then either placed before the adjective (*der gute*) or added to the end (*guter*). Only a few of the second type of adverbs may be converted into adjectives, some as *spät*, *früh* in the same way as the first type, others as *hier*, *bald*, *heute* by the addition of *-ig*.

What Bramsen says about the adverb is quite senseless. He has a paragraph of three lines on the use of the genitive of the noun as an adverb, and the remainder of the chapter is devoted to peculiarities in the number of nouns and the use of the adjective as a noun.

## THE PREPOSITION.

The practice in all the grammars was and still is to give a list of prepositions divided according to the cases governed by them. As the use of the cases properly belongs to the syntax, the result is that there is nothing left to be said about the prepositions in that section. Some grammarians such as Rowbotham repeat the whole list again in the syntax. Gottsched included amongst the prepositions the verb prefixes, and this practice is found in Wendeborn and Jehring.

## THE CONJUNCTION.

The conjunctions were usually divided into semantic groups and the question of word order treated under this heading, so that there was again nothing left for the syntax. Gottsched distinguished eight groups of conjunctions copulative, comparative, disjunctive, concessive, adversative, causal, conditional, conclusive (*daher, darum*). In this he was followed by Wendeborn and Render. These groups were further extended by Adelung to eighteen, but the uselessness of the whole procedure was recognised by the English grammarians. Noehden gives six groups, admitting that there are more but regarding a further division to be of no practical value. The others are content to give alphabetical lists. The early grammarians of the period made no distinction between co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions. A division into these two groups first appears in Becker and then becomes the property of the modern grammar.

## THE VERB.

The traditional division of the material was into seven sections, (i) auxiliaries, (ii) regular verbs, (iii) irregular verbs, (iv) neuter verbs, (v) compound verbs, (vi) impersonal verbs, (vii) reflexive verbs. In each section full paradigms are given for the active and passive. Becker first introduced as a main division the distinction between the regular and irregular verb, the order of treatment of the subsidiary types remaining the same.

There was some doubt amongst the early grammarians as to which were the auxiliary verbs. Wendeborn, Render and Rowbotham follow Gottsched and include under this heading full paradigms of *haben, sein* and *werden*, the modal auxiliaries, and *lassen*. This practice was criticised by Adelung, who only admitted *haben, sein* and *werden* and classed the remainder together as verbs of mood. Most grammars quote both *wurde*

and *ward* as the past of *werden*, and Jehring attempts to establish a difference between them. *Ward*, he says, is used to denote an action entirely passed, *wurde* one that remains unfinished

Various attempts were made by the German grammarians of the eighteenth century to classify the strong verb. Gottsched, for instance, divided them according to the vowel of the past into five classes, a practice which is found in English grammars even in the second half of the nineteenth century (e.g., Otto) Wendeborn, Render, Jehring, Noehden, Klattowsky, Bramsen and Troppaneger all regard any division as of no practical value and give an alphabetical list. Render's whole treatment of the verb is exactly the same as Wendeborn's. Both give a list of 168 verbs with the following past forms. *fochte, flochte, flohe, litte*. Their list of weak neuter verbs is also the same with the following common peculiarities: *rauspern*, to hawk, *sudeln*, to be unslovenly, *knarren*, to creak (*sic*), *klugeln*, to smatter. Boileau takes from Adelung a division into three classes together with Adelung's mnemonic words. The first class has the infinitive and past participle alike. In this there are three subdivisions characterised by the words *Paradies, Faramund, Engelhard*. The second class has the past and past participle alike and has also three subdivisions, *Heinric, Diodor, Theopomp*. The third has a different vowel in all three forms, the three subdivisions being characterised by the words *Theona, Sirona, Virgulta*. Lastly a list of fifteen verbs is given which do not fit into this scheme including *kommen, stehen, tun*, etc. This division is the one adopted by Rowbotham without the mnemonic words and is found after the middle of the century in Whitney. Becker, influenced by Jakob Grimm, introduced the distinction between the ancient and modern conjugation and is followed by Bernays and Skene. Becker also distinguishes four classes of the ancient conjugation, but his division is very faulty owing to false philological theories. The first class includes the verbs with *Ruckumlaut*, the second those verbs which originally (in Gothic which was regarded as the parent of German) had *i* in the infinitive, e.g., *finden, lesen* (Gothic *lsan*), *kommen* (Gothic *qiman*). In this class is also included *biegen* and similar verbs, although Becker does not make clear what he thought the original vowel of these verbs was. The third class has *ei* in the infinitive and the fourth *a, au* or *u* in the infinitive. In the last is included *gehen* because of the O.H.G. form *gân*. These types are then repeated by Skene and by Bernays in the exercises to his grammar.

The only point in the formation of the passive which calls for comment is the statement that the imperative of the passive is *werde du gelobt*. This

form was quoted by Gottsched, and despite Adelung's protest that it was un-German is repeated by all the English grammarians and without the pronoun is still the form quoted in the modern school grammars. The form *sei gelobt* is never mentioned by any of the grammarians of the period.

The class of neuter verbs persisted in the grammars until Becker's, when the terms transitive and intransitive appear. Wendeborn and Render give a list of verbs requiring the auxiliary *sein* and a list requiring *haben*. Their lists are identical, and like their authority Gottsched they make no attempt to discuss any principles governing the use of the auxiliaries. Jehring attempts to define the difference between the use of the auxiliaries with the verbs of motion by comparing the usage with English. He wrongly includes the reflexive verbs in this section, remarking that the auxiliary is different from English, e.g., *sie hat sich verjüngt*, she is grown younger. Rowbotham also gives lists of verbs with their respective auxiliaries together with some dubious rules as to their use. He wrongly quotes *ich habe das Pferd geritten* as a neuter verb and regards *wir haben gefroren* as a verb of motion. The whole matter is then repeated in the syntax to which it properly belongs. Noehden abandons the useless paradigms and lists of neuter verbs and gives an account of the use of the auxiliaries which differs little from that of the modern grammars. His statements become the property of the later grammarians of the period, although Becker attempts an unnecessary classification of the intransitives with *haben*. Klattowsky's formulation of the rules is peculiar and is taken word for word from Heyse. According to him the neuter verbs take *haben* if they are reflexive, or compounded with *aus-*, or if the present participle can be used as an adjective but not the past participle.

Under the compound verbs the grammarians deal with the meaning of the prefixes. The only point worth notice is that Wendeborn following Gottsched considers the verbs with a predicative adjective as compounds, e.g., *ich habe genug*.

With regard to the impersonal verbs the practice in the early grammars was to distinguish between the active and passive impersonals following the practice of the Latin grammar. For instance, *es gefällt* was regarded as an active impersonal on the analogy of the Latin *placet*, whilst *man liest* was called a passive impersonal because it was passive in Latin (*legitur*). This practice, which is quite unjustified from the standpoint of German, was adopted by Gottsched and in the English grammars by Wendeborn, Rowbotham and Boileau. Adelung put an end to this distinction, although



there remains a certain unclearness as to which verbs are impersonal. For instance, Noehden, following Adelung, remarks that verbs as *es donnert*, *es regnet* cannot be considered as impersonal because the first and second persons can be used if required and they may have a personal subject in the third person, e.g., *Gott donnert*, *die Wolken regnen*. This indecision remains in the later grammarians until Tharke who says that all verbs with the impersonal *es* as subject are proper impersonals.

Despite the fact that the German verb has strictly only two tenses, present and past, the German grammarians adopted the Latin scheme of tenses with its nomenclature and set up corresponding paradigms. The only tense in which there is any variety of treatment is the future. The German grammarians distinguished between the simple future indicative and the *futurum exactum* (*ich werde gelobt haben*). The latter term is not used by the English grammarians, most of whom call the two forms future I and future II. Wendeborn and Render make no difference between the two, calling them both future as Gottsched did. Skene calls the second tense the future past. Wendeborn and Render, again influenced by Gottsched, give a future of the imperative with the auxiliary *sollen*, but this was attacked by Adelung and is not found in subsequent English grammars.

#### THE SYNTAX.

##### (1) *Word Order.*

The early German grammarians gave no clear account of the principles of German word order principally because they had not learnt to distinguish between principal and subordinate sentences. The same helpless attitude is seen in the English grammars. Wendeborn, like his authority Gottsched, gives no complete account of word order. He attributes, like Gottsched, the difference between the direct and subordinate order to a difference in the mood of the verb. He says (p. 130): 'In the beginning of a sentence the auxiliary verbs are to be used in the indicative, but in the conjunctive at the end of a sentence.' He then follows the old method of giving a model sentence with varying orders of words, but derives no general principles from them. Even as late as 1820 we find Bouleau saying (p. 397): 'I think it the shortest way by far to inform the classical student at once that the German language enjoys as great a latitude of freedom in the arrangement of words as the Latin.' Jehring (1820) shows an improvement. He distinguishes four types of word order, (i) the common or indicative (the order is therefore still regarded as a matter of the mood), (ii) the question order, (iii) the emphatic order (equal to the

modern inverted order), (iv) the relative order. No main distinction is made between principal and subordinate sentences. The fullest treatment of the question was given by Noehden whose rules are comprehensive and accurate although he does not distinguish between different types of sentences. The arrangement of the section is open to criticism, for Noehden deals with the direct and inverted order under the heading 'position of the noun', whilst the subordinate order is regarded as a matter of the position of the verb. The modern treatment of word order is reached in Becker who distinguishes between principal and subordinate sentences. This is then taken over by Bernays and Tiarks. Tiarks' formulation of the rules might be quoted, as it shows how closely he followed Becker whenever he deviated from Noehden. In this section of his grammar Tiarks adopts Becker's peculiar terminology which is quite different from the remainder of Tiarks' work. Becker (p. 252) 'When the relational verb or a separable compound verb is in a compound form, the inflected part of the verb takes the place of the copula and the participle form is placed after the predicate.' Tiarks (p. 227). 'When these verbs which take the place of the copula are used in a compound form the inflected parts of the verb only take the place of the copula and the participle and infinitive belonging to them stands after the predicate'

(ii) *The use of Tenses.*

The only point of interest is the use of the tenses of the past, and this seems to be one of the most confused chapters in the history of German grammatical theory. The confusion arises from differing usages in different parts of Germany and partly from an incorrect approach to the problem. Gottsched and the grammarians before him attempt to arrive at some theory of the use of the tenses in German from a definition of the Latin terms. Gottsched had two theories. In the etymology he taught that the use of the imperfect, perfect and pluperfect depended on whether the action was 'kaum oder unlangst, vollig, oder vorlangst vergangen'. This is repeated by Wendeborn who remarks: 'The past is either imperfectly past, or perfectly or it is a long while since it passed.' In the syntax Gottsched advanced another theory which contradicts the above. This may be quoted in full as it plays an important part in the later English grammars. 'Wenn man etwas erzahlt, dabey man selbst zugewegewesen oder daran man mit Theil gehabt, so bedient man sich der unlangst vergangenen Zeit, redet man aber von dem, was andere ohne uns getan haben, so nimmt man die vollig vergangene Zeit.' The imperfect is used then when the speaker was an eyewitness of the events narrated, the

perfect when the speaker was not an eyewitness. This theory is disproved by the existence of a perfect form as *ich habe gesehen*. Adelung still clings to the idea that the tenses depend on the distance from the present (Gottsched's first theory), but he shows the beginnings of a new conception of the use of the tenses, namely that the tenses depend on the relation of the events narrated to others in the narration. The imperfect, he says, is used of an action recently passed, from which he deduces quite illogically that the imperfect is the tense used in 'zusammenhangender Erzählung', 'wo Dinge aufeinander folgend dargestellt werden'. The imperfect is therefore the tense of historical narration ('das wahre Tempus historicum des Deutschen'). The perfect is used when an action is related which stands alone not in relation to others. Noehden shows a similar confusion. With Becker the idea of the distance from the present is completely abandoned and the use of the tenses correctly explained as depending solely on the relation of the action to others. The idea of the eyewitness was, however, revived in later grammars. Klatowsky, taking all his details again from Heyse, says that the imperfect is a 'Zeit mit Beziehung', whilst the perfect is the 'Zeit ohne Beziehung'. The imperfect is therefore 'das wahre Tempus historicum des Deutschen'. This is immediately contradicted in the following statement taken word for word from Heyse 'Wenn man nicht selbst Augenzeuge einer Begebenheit gewesen ist, gebraucht man nicht das Imperfectum sondern das Perfectum.' Tarks gives exactly the same statement. The whole theory of the eyewitness is completely reversed by Bernays: 'The perfect denotes recent events, especially if the speaker has witnessed them himself.' With this the opposite to Gottsched's theory is reached. Gottsched's theory still survives in the modern grammar. Curme, for example, says (p. 213) that the eyewitness naturally uses the past tense, but in relating events not actually witnessed by the speaker the perfect is used.

### (iii) *The use of the subjunctive.*

This subject was originally treated in the etymology under the heading conjunctions and was repeated in the syntax of the conjunctions. Wendeborn's account is most scanty. He repeats Gottsched's statement that the indicative denotes a simple action whilst the conjunctive indicates the connection of one action with another. The conjunctive is also used after *dass* to express doubt. Jehring simply says that the use of the subjunctive is similar to English except that it is used to imply doubt. Noehden points out that the subjunctive has nothing to do with the conjunctions and assigns it to the syntax of the verb. He gives a full

account of the subjunctive of indirect narration but nothing on what tenses are used. Rowbotham deals with the subject under the conjunction *dass* and says only that the tense implies doubt. Klattowsky has a fuller account modelled on Heyse. He distinguishes between the subjunctive after verbs as *wollen*, *bitten*, *befehlen*, the conditional, the optative, and the conjunctive after verbs of saying. He has nothing to say about the tenses of indirect narration, and his distinction between the subjunctive and the conjunctive can hardly be called systematic. Becker gives the first full and modern account of the subjunctive in German together with rules for the tenses. This is the source of Tiarks' rules. Again, Tiarks adopts Becker's terminology, although he had used quite different terms in his paradigms of the subjunctive. He follows Becker, for instance, in calling the tense of the sentence *Wenn ich Zeit hatte, so ginge ich aus*, the present conditional, so called by Becker because *jetzt* can be inserted.

It will have become apparent from the above account that it was Noehden's grammar which first established in this country the traditional method of presenting German grammar to English students. Noehden's account of German grammar is comprehensive and accurate in its details and was far in advance of anything published on the subject before 1800. Later grammarians have improved Noehden here and there but have not made any radical alterations.

CHARLES T. CARR.

ST ANDREWS.

## MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

### PROVERBS IN THE 'ANCREN RIWLE' AND THE 'RECLUSE'.

The following note is a supplement to D. V. Ives's recent study of the proverbs in the *Ancren Riwele*.<sup>1</sup> There are several sayings not included by Miss Ives which appear to be proverbial, and, in addition, it is instructive to see how many of the proverbs in the *Ancren Riwele* were preserved in its fourteenth-century adaptation, commonly called the *Recluse*.<sup>2</sup> This recension shows significant changes, many of them apparently parallel to those made in the Latin translation, most of which are intended to remove the personal touches and to make the work applicable to men and women alike. The author's treatment of the proverbial material is interesting, since he retains most, but in some places alters, drops, and adds.

I give Miss Ives's categories and numbers for such of the proverbs as survive in the *Recluse*, and beside them the page and line in the *Recluse*. Passages in the *Recluse* which show changes of any significance are quoted.

Ives		<i>Recluse</i>
<i>Scriptural</i>		
(1)	Pp 4, ll 19f.; 5, l. 26.	
(2)	P. 35, l. 24.	
(3)	P. 38, l. 28 <sup>3</sup>	
(4)	P. 160, l. 24: Ac bettere is late þan neuer Austin seip.	
(5)	Pp 170, l. 32; 171, l. 1	
(6)	P. 192, l. 22.	
<i>Classical</i>		
(2)	(a) P. 84, ll 6f (b) Not in <i>Recluse</i> .	
(3)	P. 50, ll. 11f.	
(5)	P. 63, ll 18f.. As Men seien on englsch. Cok is kene on his owen dunge hyll.	
(6)	Pp 28, ll. 18f.; 69, ll. 25ff	

<sup>1</sup> *M.L.R.* xxix (1934), pp 257 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. J. Pahlsson (*Acta Universitatis Lundensis*, N.S., No. vi, 1), Lund, 1910, re-issued separately at Lund in 1918, with the addition of 130 pages of notes, but without disturbing the pagination and line numbers of the text.

<sup>3</sup> The proverb, 'Euer is þe ene to þe wude leie, þerinne is þet ich lumen', which Miss Ives gives here is not to be found in the *Recluse*. I have elsewhere (*Speculum*, ix (1934), pp 219 f.) quoted in connection with this passage an English saying found in one of Odo of Cherington's fables: 'If al that the wolf unto a preest worthe, / And he set unto book psalmes to leere, / Yit his eye is evere to the wodeward' (T. Wright, *Selection of Latin Stories*, Percy Society [1842], p. 229, and see also L. Hervieux, *Les Fabulistes latins*, iv [1896], p. 195, cf. pp 22 f.). Froissart gives a French parallel, 'Toudis refuit le leu au bos', *Le Joli Buisson de Jonece* [*Poésies*, ed. A. Scheler, Brussels, 1870-2, ii, p. 125, l. 4239], and see E. Fehse, *Spruchwort und Sentenz bei Eustache Deschamps und Dichtern seiner Zeit* [Erlangen, 1905], p. 9, no. 23. We probably have here a proverb which became incorporated in a song or ballad of the 'greenwood' type. The additions made by the scribe of the Cotton Cleopatra MS. would indicate that he recognised it as a jungle.

Add *A R.*, p 66

- (7) P 51, ll 31f
- (8) Pp 22, ll 35f, 140, ll 4f A lefdi seide a spark brougth al hir hous on  
brennyng & so it fareþ ofte of litel comeþ mychel
- (9) P 190, ll 16f And þefore stureþ zou quiklich in good werkes & dryueþ  
out þise two
- (10) P 49, l 30
- (11) Pp 140, ll 8f, 160, ll 15ff : For oft men seien on olde Englisch. he þat  
wl noughth whan he may. he schal noughth whan he wolde.

*Popular*

- (1) P. 5, ll. 29f

Add *A R.*, p 10

- (3) P. 25, ll. 8f . For men seien abywoorde þe hounde wl jn þere he fyndeþ  
open
- (5) P. 37, ll 23f. Jt fareþ by þe Cherle as by þe wyþe þe more men  
croppen it þe more it wexeþ
- (7) P 40, l. 2: And euere þe lenger þe wers it is
- (8) Pp. 119, ll 7f ; 49, l. 29. Lete lust ouergoo & eft it wl þe lyke, as þe  
versifiour seip.
- (9) P. 50, ll 29f
- (10) Pp 103, l 35; 104, l 2
- (11) P. 122, ll. 2ff : As men seþ often a litel rayn felleþ a gret wynde so done  
bedes and teres wip al fellen þe deuels blastes and þan comeþ þe sunne  
and schineþ after and makeþ al fair & drye
- (14) P. 150, ll. 27ff
- (15) P. 188, ll. 1ff.

This comprises the proverbs which Miss Ives prints. There are, however, in the *Ancren Riwle* several sayings which seem as popular as most which Miss Ives gives. I give these hereafter with references to, or quotations from, the *Recluse*

- (1) Mo sleað word þene sweord (P 74; *Recluse*, p. 32, l 13. For men saien.  
Mo men slen wip woorde þan wip knyf )
- (2) Seldcene speche haueð muche strencoðe (P 78, *Recluse*, p. 34, l. 33.)
- (3) þeo hwule þet zichinge ilest, hit puncheð god for to gniden, auh þerefter  
me izeleð hit bitterliche smeorten (P. 238; *Recluse*, p. 119, ll 8f.)
- (4) Me nimeð et vuel dettur oten uor hweate. (P. 312; *Recluse*, p 145, ll.  
34f.)

In addition to these, the *Ancren Riwle* contains a considerable number of sententious remarks, which, while they are not popular, are by no means strictly theological.

- (1) Þe hen hwon heo haueð ileid, ne con buten kakelen (*and loses her eggs*).  
(P 66, *Recluse*, p. 28, ll 12ff.)
- (2) Me ileueð þet vuel sone. (P 68, *Recluse*, p 29, ll. 8f.)
- (3) Muche fol he were þe muhte, to his owene bihoue, hweðer se he wolde,  
grunden grot oðer hwete, 3if he grunde þe grot and lefde þene hwete.  
(P 70; *Recluse*, p 29, ll. 28f.: A foole he were þat mizth grynde whete  
and grundeþ grauel )
- (4) And of a drope waxeð a muche flod. (P. 74; *Recluse*, p 33, ll. 19ff : Men  
seep often of droppes wexen a mychel floode and drenchen þe londe  
þere þe goode corne is sownen )
- (5) Ueond þet puncheð freond is swike ouer alle swike. (P. 98.)

- (6) Hwat is word bute wind? (P 122)
- (7) Vor ne beo neuer so briht gold, ne seoluer, ne iren, ne stel, pet hit ne schal drawen rust of on pet is irusted, uor hwon pet heo longe liggan togederes (P 160, *Recluse*, pp 71, l 33-72, l 2)
- (8) Dis bruchele (*virginity*) uetles is bruchelure pene beo emi gles, uor beo hit enes to-broken, ibet ne bið hit neuer, ne ihol ase hit er was, nanmore pane gles (P 164, *Recluse*, p 81, ll 5f For maydenhode may neuere ben ybett and it be ones ybroken nomore þan þe glas)
- (9) Uor stench stihð uppard, and 3e beoð heie iclumben, þer þe wind is muchel of stronge tentaciuns (Pp 216-18)
- (10) Seið Job þeos wordes: "Lapides excavant aque, et alluvione paulatim terra consumitur" Lutle dropen þurleð pene ulint pet ofte ualleð peron (P 220)
- (11) No sihðe pet 3e iseoð, ne wakinde ne slepinde, ne me swefne, ne telle 3e bute dweole (P 224; *Recluse*, p 111, l 20 Ne siȝth þat 3e sen in sweuene ne tellep it for nouȝth)
- (12) Þe tur nis nout asaied, ne þe castel, ne þe cite hwon heo beoð biwunnen. (P. 228; *Recluse*, p. 113, ll 19f)
- (13) Best is euer mete. (P 286)
- (14) Kulure . . . is wiðuten galle. (P 292, *Recluse*, p. 138, l. 30)
- (15) Auh þe wordes schulen beon ischeawede efter þe werkes (P. 316, *Recluse*, p. 147, l 2. Ac saie þe wordes after þe werkes)
- (16) Þe deouel nis nout dead zet (P 346)
- (17) Me buð lhtliche a þing pet me lueð lutel (P 392, *Recluse*, p. 185, ll. 19f : Men buggen hȝth cost a þing þat men leten ltel of)
- (18) Me let lesse deinté to þinge pet me haueð ofte. (P. 412)
- (19) Iren pet hð stille gedereð sone rust (P 422.)

There are a certain number of proverbial phrases in the *Ancoren Riwle*, a majority of which are comparisons, and these are neither unusual nor especially popular.

- (1) Soule . . . schal iwurðen. . . lhture þen þe wind is, and brihture þen þe sunne is (P. 140, *Recluse*, p 63, ll. 9ff)
- (2) 3e beon swifte ase þe sunne gleam. (P 170)
- (3) Al nis nout so muche ase a lutel ðeawes drope aȝean þe brode see, and alle þe worldes wateres (P 184; *Recluse*, p. 87, ll 10f.)
- (4) Al pet wo of þisse worlde refned to helle alre leste pine, al nis bute ase bal pleowe (P 184.)
- (5) Wute 3e pet to soðe pet al þe wo of þisse worlde, al nis bute ase a scheadewe aȝean þe wo of helle (P. 190; *Recluse*, p. 87, ll. 9f.)
- (6) Vre widerwines beoð swifture þen þe earnes (P. 196, *Recluse*, p. 95, l 29.)
- (7) Herdi ase leun. (P. 274.)
- (8) Lomb her and hun þer. (P. 304; *Recluse*, p. 142, l. 28)
- (9) Snou hwite cloðes. (P. 314)
- (10) Þu schalt beon seoueuold brihtre þen þe sunne. (P 398; *Recluse*, p 188, ll 16f.)

The miscellaneous proverbial phrases are somewhat more interesting.

- (1) Þe vikelare ablent pene mon and put him preon in eien, pet he mid vikeleð. (P. 84; *Recluse*, p. 36, ll. 18f.: Þe losengere abyndeþ þe man. and putteþ þe Pryk in his erȝe)
- (2) Hit is Judases cos. (P. 194.)
- (3) Þe pet is umbe, wiðuten hire, uorte gederen gode þeawes, he bereð dust iðe winde, ase Seint Gregorie witneð: "Qui sine humilitate uirtutes congregat quasi qui in uento puluerem portat." (P. 278; *Recluse*, p. 133, ll. 22ff.)
- (4) Ne beoð nout wurð a nelds. (P. 400; *Recluse*, p. 188, l. 27.)

To compensate for his omissions the author of the *Recluse* added a certain amount of proverbial material of his own. We find two proverbs, the second of which had appeared in the *Ancren Riwele* in another context.

- (1) And ȝif þe fox do yuel ȝutt men sayen wers by hym (P 53, ll 21f)
- (2) Better is late þan neuere. (P 119, l. 12f)

There are six sententious remarks

- (1) And so it fareþ of man by womman whan sche spekep faire & casteþ enchesoun and seiþ sche ne dar nouȝth By her tale sche wolde ȝif sche durst (P 40, ll 2ff, cf *Ancren Riwele*, p 98)
- (2) A litel prickyng in þe eige dereþ more þan a gret wounde in þe hele. (P 44, ll 29f)
- (3) An hondeful of ȝerdes while hij ben to ȝiders hij nyllen nouȝth breken (P. 125, ll 5f, cf *A R*, pp. 250, 252.)
- (4) Men turnen ofte þe nebbe to þing þat Men louen & awayward fro þing þat Men haten (P 125, ll 14ff)
- (5) As god seiþ in þe goßpell whan þe blinde ledeþ þe blinde boþe fallen in þe diche (P 162, l 33-163, l 1)
- (6) Þat ben mysbileuand men þat done as þe hounde doþe whan he hap eten to mychel he casteþ it & goþ aȝein & eteþ it. (P 198, ll 26ff.)

There are six more or less proverbial comparisons

- (1) For oure moup stynkep vpon hym fouler þan any roten dogge (Pp 33, ll 31f, 99, l 30)
- (2) Þat smott hym to þe hert as a spere (P 44, ll 15f)
- (3) Stille in þine hert as a ston. (P. 58, ll 4f)
- (4) It bicomþ als wel as who so putt a gold ringe in a swynes nose (P 97, ll 1f)
- (5) Hij schull bene clere as glas porouȝ jnnocence of baptesme. (P 196, ll. 25f.)
- (6) He schewed me a clere flode as Cristal. (P 197, ll. 8f)

There are but two other proverbial phrases.

- (1) Ȝe; a more fole þan he þat bereþ a Babyl (P 121, ll 16f)
- (2) J nolde nouȝth ȝiue a nedel for al her werk. (P. 55, ll. 13f)

One thing is especially noteworthy about the author of the *Ancren Riwele* and his use of proverbial material. Few religious writers before the Reformation made, relatively speaking, use of as many proverbs, and no one used proverbs more skilfully. If we examine the proverbs in the *Ancren Riwele* in relation to their immediate context we find them woven into the subject matter with a skill and feeling that almost equals Chaucer's. The author of the *Ancren Riwele* was addressing women and appealed to their understanding by means of homely illustrations and sayings, for, though the ladies to whom he wrote were doubtless of good birth and average education, they were women, and women of the Middle Ages were not often supposed to be amenable to more scholarly arguments.

B. J. WHITING.



## MILTON AND THE 'POSTSCRIPT'.

Appended to *An Answer To A Booke Entituled An Humble Remonstrance* (1641) there is a 'Postscript', with an introduction, which I quote because it is relevant to the following argument:

Though we might have added much light and beauty to our Discourse, by inserting variety of Histories upon severall occasions given us in the *Remonstrance*, the answer whereof wee have undertaken; especially where it speaks of the *bounty* and *gracious Munificence* of *Religious Princes* toward the *Bishops*, yet unwilling to break the thread of our discourse, and its connexion with the *Remonstrance*, by so large a digression, as the whole series of History producible to our purpose, would extend unto Wee have chosen rather to subjoyne by way of *appendix*, an historical Narration of those bitter fruits, *Pride*, *Rebellion*, *Treason*, *Unthankfulness*, &c which have issued from *Episcopacy*, while it hath stood under the continued influences of Sovereigne goodness Which Narration would fill a volume, but we wil bound our selves unto the stories of this Kingdome, and that revolution of time which hath passed over us since the erection of the *Sea of Canterbury* (p 85)

The 'Postscript' then vigorously sketches the lurid history of Episcopacy from Augustine to Gardiner and Ridley, with marginal references to sources, such as Bede, Holinshed, Speed, and Stowe, with which the page numbers are often included. Though partisan, the 'Postscript' thus has abundant historical authority. The survey, vivid and impressive, was doubtless very gratifying to the Puritans.

Masson was the first to associate Milton with this 'Postscript'. He says: 'He contributed, as I calculate, rough notes or material for about twenty of its pages.'<sup>1</sup> Later, becoming more positive, he cites from *Animadversions upon The Remonstrants Defence, Against Smectymnuus* Milton's reply to Hall's charge that the 'Postscript' is 'a goodly pasquin, borrowed for a great part out of *Sion's Plea* or the Breviate consisting of a rhapsody of histories'. Milton says 'the collection was taken, be it knowne to you, from as authentique authors in this kinde as any in a Bishops library; and the collector of it sayes moreover, that if the like occasion come againe, hee shall lesse have need the help of breviate, or historical rhapsodies, than your reverence to eek out your sermonings shall need repaire to *Postills*, or *Pohanthea's*'.<sup>2</sup> Masson thinks this is Milton's 'virtual acknowledgment of the authorship of the Postscript to the Smectymnuan treatise . . .'.<sup>3</sup> Mr W. T. Hale follows Masson's lead.<sup>4</sup> He believes that Milton was the author of the 'Postscript'; at least, he says, 'it must be conceded that he compiled the examples from English

<sup>1</sup> *The Life of John Milton* (London: Macmillan, 1871), II, p. 238

<sup>2</sup> *The Works of John Milton* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), III, pp. 173-4

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, pp. 260-1.

<sup>4</sup> *Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England . . .*, Edited by Will Tahaferro Hale (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1916), pp. lxx-lv.

history enumerated in it' Comparing the 'Postscript' with *Of Reformation*, he declares that the spirit of both is the same, that the historical allusions are for the most part identical, and that there is 'an agreement in the wording that could not have been accidental' There for some years the matter has rested. Did Milton collect material for or write the 'Postscript'? I propose to re-examine this subject

In the first place, it is, I think, quite unnecessary and unreasonable to assume that the 'Postscript' was written by any other than one or more of the Smectymnuans. From the mere fact that it forms an appendix, it seems to be inferred that some outsider was concerned. But, as the introduction quoted at the outset of this paper shows, there was a valid reason for printing the historical sketch at the end. it was put there to prevent breaking 'the thread of our discourse, and its connexion with the *Remonstrance*, by so large a digression . . .' The 'Postscript', then, was probably not an afterthought, and by design it was placed at the end of the closely reasoned *Answer* to Bishop Hall. Again, it is much more probable that one or more of the five men responsible for the *Answer* should have carried out the task of collecting facts for and composing the 'Postscript' to the *Answer*, which appeared in March, than that it should have been done by Milton, who was probably then engaged alone in writing *Of Reformation*, which appeared little more than a month later, and who also then or soon afterwards had *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* upon the stocks. In the light of these facts Milton's authorship of the 'Postscript' seems rather doubtful.

There is in the 'Postscript' almost positive proof that Milton was not the author. Regarding the bishops under Edward VI the 'Postscript' has the following:

The violent opposition of the Popish Bishops, which made *Martin Bucer* write to King *Edward* in his booke *de Regno Christi* Lib. 2. cap 1 and say, your Majestie doth see, that this restoring againe the Kingdome of Christ, which wee require, yea, which the salvation of us all requireth, may in no wise bee expected to come from the Bishops, seeing there be so few among them which doe understand the power and proper Offices of this Kingdome, and very many of them by all meanes (which possibly they can and dare) oppose themselves against it, or deferre and hinder it (Pp 102-3)

Now, it is remarkable that Milton does not mention Bucer's *De Regno Christi* in any of his ecclesiastical pamphlets. The first time Bucer and his work are mentioned in Milton is in *The Iudgement of Martin Bucer, Concerning Divorce. Writt'n to Edward the sixth, in his second Book of the Kingdom of Christ* . . . (1644); and here, as the following quotation shows, it seems that Milton had for the first time come upon Bucer's work In the first part of the quotation, Milton is, of course, referring to his

*Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. 'When the book had bin now the second time set forth wel-nigh three months, as I best remember, I then first came to hear that Martin Bucer had writt'n much concerning divorce: whom earnestly turning over, I soon perceav'd, but not without amazement, in the same opinion, confirm'd with the same reasons which in that publisht book without the help or imitation of any precedent Writer, I had labour'd out, and laid together'<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the quotation in the 'Postscript' is from Book II of *De Regno Christi*, the same book from which Milton later quoted. If Milton was not acquainted with Bucer's work before 1644, the conclusion is almost unescapable. he did not write the paragraph just quoted from the 'Postscript'

Further proof tending to show that Milton was not the author of the 'Postscript' could be cited: the similarity between the 'Postscript' and a section of Alexander Leighton's *An Appeal to the Parliament, or Sions Plea against the Prelacy* . (1628),<sup>2</sup> and stylistic evidences which indicate that frequently phrasing in the 'Postscript' follows closely the sources (such as Speed's *History of Great Britaine* . . . (1627)) which were also Milton's sources—therefore no argument can be based upon occasional phrasing common to the 'Postscript' and *Of Reformation*. But probably no additional proof is needed. Under the circumstances, absolute certainty may be beyond reach; but, in lieu of that, we may say with reasonable conviction that Milton had nothing to do with the 'Postscript'.

GEORGE W. WHITING.

HOUSTON, TEXAS.

DATE OF THE MYSTÈRE DU CONCILE DE BASLE, ATTRIBUTED TO  
GEORGES CHASTELAIN.

Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, in his edition of the works of Georges Chastelain,<sup>3</sup> opens the sixth volume with the *Mystère du Concile de Basle*. In his preface he writes: ' . . il paraît remonter à l'année 1432 ou 1433.' This view is, however, contradicted by M. Vallet de Viriville in his review of the edition.<sup>4</sup> Basing his remarks on an odd reference to the Council, as if the Council had not taken place, he concludes that the *Mystère* must have been written before 1431.

It is, however, possible to select certain other passages which help to fix the date a little more definitely. The career of the Council of Basle was

<sup>1</sup> *Op cit.*, iv, p 13

<sup>2</sup> Pp 30 ff. In *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance* (1641) Hall called attention to this similarity.

<sup>3</sup> Eight tomes, Bruxelles, 1863-6.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal des Savants*, March 1867.

stormy and often interrupted. Vallet de Viriville does not appear to have considered that aspect of the question

'Reformation' says.

Je promets qu'à Basle n'a  
Qui sache si jamais verra  
Le temps que Concile sera <sup>1</sup>

This apparent indication of a future Council may in reality refer to a resumption of the Council's work. Indeed, it is more than probable. The Council opened in 1431, and 'France' says

J'avoie envoyé à l'empire,  
A Basle, pour avoir confort  
De conseil <sup>2</sup>

These lines appear to have been written after the failure of the first part of the Council.

After assembling the French prelates at Bourges, February 26, 1432, Charles VII ordered them to go to Basle. In the *Mystère* 'France' declares.

Adieu clercs, nobles, bourgeois.  
Je m'en vois  
A Basle pour vos mesfaits...<sup>3</sup>

Further on 'Paix' seems to imply that the Council was already in existence, for she says that everybody would be disappointed 'd'estre venu yci en van'.<sup>4</sup> Immediately before, 'Concile' has said:

Vous avez cy de bons amis,  
Créez, chascun labourera  
Si bien que vous amendera,  
Si Dieu plaist, ains que je départe.

The general impression is that the Council has already assembled once at least.

There are two references which have the advantage of being precise and of indicating that the *Mystère* was written after 1431.

'Concile' mentions:

Il y a des gens hors et ens  
Qui sèment que depuis trois ans  
Et plus, le Concile n'a riens fait <sup>5</sup>

Even allowing a certain margin for inaccuracy, it is still obvious that the Council had existed for some time when the *Mystère* was written. The continuation is even more definite.

Est-ce riens d'avoir fait venir  
Les Boesmes et convenir...

<sup>1</sup> K de L, vi, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 35-6.

The representatives of the Hussites, Rokyczana and Procope, accompanied by 300 men, went to Basle in January, 1432. The *Mystère* is, hence, posterior to this date.

The last reference of importance is in a speech by 'Hérésie'.

Attendez que revienne cy  
L'ambassade qui est en Boesme <sup>1</sup>

The Hussites, having failed to settle matters at Basle, departed and were followed by representatives of the Council who made a treaty with them, the Compactata of Prague, November 30, 1433. Since the *Mystère* contains no reference to the conclusion of the Compactata, we may assume that it was written before November 30, 1433.

It seems, then, probable that the *Mystère du Concile de Basle* was written in either 1432 or 1433, and not about 1430 as Vallet de Virville believed.<sup>2</sup>

KENNETH URWIN.

MARSEILLES.

<sup>1</sup> K. de L., vi, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> This in no way invalidates his arguments for believing that Chastelain is not the author of the *Mystère*

## REVIEWS

*The Exeter Book* Pt II. *Poems ix-xxxii*. Edited by W. S. MACKIE. (Early English Text Society, Original Series, 194) London H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1934 (for 1933). ix + 245 pp. 18s.

This volume is a completion of the work begun by the late Sir Israel Gollancz who in 1895 published the first eight poems of the Exeter Book with translation and critical notes for the E. E. T. S. And now after forty years the rest appears under the editorship of Professor Mackie. It is in every way a worthy completion of Gollancz's work. The editor has followed his predecessor's conservative methods and has only allowed himself to emend the text where it was absolutely necessary. The text has been prepared with the greatest care and accuracy with the help of the recently published facsimile of the Exeter Book. The comparison of Professor Mackie's transcript with that of Professor Chambers and Mr Flower has been of mutual advantage in elucidating some of the difficulties of the last fourteen leaves of the Codex.

Side by side with the text there is a useful translation. Professor Mackie has succeeded in the difficult task of making his translation at the same time accurate and readable. It will be of the greatest value to the student of Anglo-Saxon whose knowledge of the language is limited and to the ordinary reader. He has carefully avoided the pseudo-antique mannerisms which spoil so many translations from Anglo-Saxon.

I have noted a few points in the translation in which I am inclined to differ from Professor Mackie. It seems preferable on the whole to translate *eorlas* as 'warrior' rather than 'earl' (except, of course, in instances where, as in *The Battle of Maldon*, *eorl* is used as a title), *oft* is nearly always better translated by 'continually' rather than 'often' and *sona* by 'at once' rather than 'soon' (cf., e.g., *Riddle* 16, ll. 1-9). In the *Seafarer*, l. 22, *hwilpan* should be 'whaup' rather than 'whale', l. 47, *se þe on lagu fundað*, 'he who seeks to cross the sea'; l. 99, *þat hi ne wille*. there seems to be no need to emend here—a brother buries gold with the dead man 'which he (the brother) wishes to go with him (the dead man)'; l. 103, 'Great is the terror of the Judge; because of it the earth is removed'—this is possibly a reference to *Psalm* xlvii, 2. *Riddle* 9, l. 12, add 'dear' after 'own'. *Riddle* 21: this well-known riddle faithfully describes the heavy type of plough illustrated in such MSS. as Cotton Tib. B.v. or Add. MS. 24098 f. 26 b; it is the type described by Vergil in *Georgics* i, 169-75; *wegen on wægne* in l. 8 evidently means 'borne on a fore-carriage', that part in fact which Vergil describes as *currus*—the traditional translation, 'carried on a wagon', is meaningless, it also seems better to take *þæt ic to þum tere* as the subject of *fealleþ*, 'what I tear with my teeth falls to one side', this gives a better sense for *fealleþ*. *Riddle* 27, *dole æfter dyntum*, 'dazed as a result of the blows [they receive]'. *The Wife's Complaint*, l. 30. the poet is describing the wife's cave in the earth; *sindon dena ðimme duna uphæa*

*bute burgtunas brerum geweaxene*, 'Its depths are gloomy, its banks tower up high, cruel are the enclosing fences, overgrown with briars'. The translation of ll. 43-6 seems to miss the sense of the poem by interpreting the lines as a sort of curse upon the absent lover which does not fit in with the latter part of the poem, at the same time it misses the typical heroic exhortation that a warrior should hide his sorrows beneath a cheerful countenance. It seems better to translate the lines in the following way: 'Though a young man should constantly be sad in spirit and though the thoughts of his heart are bitter, yet he must have a cheerful demeanour as well, even if, along with it, he has grief of soul and a throng of constant sorrows. Whether there be at his disposal all the joy that the world can give him or whether it be that, far-banished in a distant land, my lover...sits...yet my lord suffers, etc.' But the above are only small matters of difference of opinion. The volume is clearly in the best tradition of Anglo-Saxon scholarship.

BERTRAM COLGRAVE.

DURHAM.

*Speculum Christiani. A Middle English Religious Treatise of the Fourteenth Century.* Edited by G. HOLMSTEDT (Early English Text Society, Original Series, 182.) London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1933 (for 1929). ccv + 346 pp. 25s.

The body of this work offers a transcript of one of the many Latin MSS. of this mediæval religious treatise, MS. Lansdowne 344, and of the one complete Middle English translation, MS. Harley 6580. Other partial Middle English versions exist, which afford the editor much material for variants. Dr Holmstedt describes no fewer than sixty-six manuscripts, nearly all in great detail, a work of labour, and deserving of much credit. He describes and groups the MSS. well, but treats the printed editions less satisfactorily, though one is pleased that he has not ignored these, as do so many editors of Middle English texts. The oldest extant printed edition was printed by William de Machlinia at London, without date, but the work has been dated 1478, 1480, 1484, and 1486. The second of these is more generally accepted, and is the one adopted by Dr Holmstedt, though apparently without examination. Moreover, he does not make use of the *Short-Title Catalogue*, which records some copies of this edition not known to him, copies in the John Rylands Library and Peterborough Cathedral, besides three at least in America, in the Huntington, Pierpont Morgan, and New York Public libraries. He records, however, another copy in Trinity College Library, Cambridge, and quotes Dibdin's authority for copies possessed in his day by His Majesty, the Marquis of Blandford and Earl Spencer. The latter is not very satisfactory for sales of books have taken place in the last hundred years. Dr Holmstedt describes French editions of 1496, 1502, 1513, and one without date. He does not, however, discuss the relationship, if any, between the *Speculum Christiani* and the *Speculum Christianum* of Henry Nelson, published anonymously by G. Eld in 1614.

Dr Holmstedt discusses very excellently indeed the question of authorship, and points out the common error of attributing it to one J. Wotton. The *Short-Title Catalogue* does this, following earlier bibliographical works. The ultimate bibliographical source is Tanner's *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica*, 1748, where the name is given as J. Watton, probably on the authority of Corpus Christi College MS 155. Dr Holmstedt denies that the authority of this MS is strong enough, since seven other MSS. give other ascriptions, most of which are undoubtedly the names of copyists. But perhaps Dr Holmstedt is a little rigorous in denying, on p. clxxv, that 'no two MSS. give the same name', since MS Harley 206 also ascribes the authorship to one Watton, though it is now William de Watton, *Liber compilatus per Willelmum de Wattone*. In insisting that the same person is not intended, by not considering the possibility of error, Dr Holmstedt forgets that, by his own showing, MS. Corpus 155 and MS. Harley 206 are related, though not directly, both being descended from a common ancestor. But he is right in insisting that the case for Watton is 'not proven', and that the form Wotton is incorrect.

The only complaint I have to make against this admirable piece of editing is that the quotations from the Fathers are not traced to their sources. This would not have been such a formidable task as might appear at first sight, since the same authorities are quoted over and over again.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

SHEFFIELD.

*The Struggle for the Freedom of the Press from Caxton to Cromwell.* By WILLIAM M. CLYDE. Published for St Andrew's University by Humphrey Milford. 1934. xvi + 360 pp. 10s 6d.

The title of this book is seriously misleading. The main portion is an elaborate historical study of the conditions of the book-trade from the outbreak of the Civil War to the death of the Lord Protector, to which has been prefixed a single chapter covering the earlier period from 1476 onwards. Moreover, while the author obviously has an intimate and first-hand knowledge of his particular field, he shows no such familiarity with the approach to it—at least, the first forty pages of his work justify this conclusion. Nor is this the only objection that may be brought against Dr Clyde's treatment of his subject, for throughout there runs a confusion between two aspects of the Freedom of the Press, which are in reality almost unrelated. The phrase may on the one hand mean no more than the right of any man to print any authorised work he pleases, regardless of the claims of other individuals, on the other hand, it may mean the right of an author to express his views in print, uncontrolled by any system of censorship. The former is mainly a craft matter that resolves itself historically into the revolt by the rank and file of the Stationers, or of the bolder spirits among them, against the custom of



granting privileges or monopolies for certain classes of books. The latter is of vastly greater importance, involving no less, in an age of print, than the Freedom of Thought and Speech. The confusion of these two widely disparate themes is of less consequence in the years 1642-58, for the craft dispute was then in abeyance, and it is the trumpet call of *Areopagitica* that dominates the fray. But in the earlier period the Freedom of the Press as a principle in the history of liberty had not yet been formulated, and found only incidental expression, while the struggle against privilege was at its height in the Company, and a work that confuses under one title the revolt of men like Wolf and Ward on the one hand, and of Penry and Waldegrave on the other, cannot be said to make for enlightenment.

Of Dr Clyde's intimate acquaintance with the tortuous by-ways of press-regulation during the Civil War and Commonwealth period, and of his diligence in pursuing them, his later chapters afford ample evidence. Less, perhaps, of his ability to assimilate the wealth of information he has collected. The subject, however, is one of singular intricacy, and the author can hardly be blamed if his attempt to unravel its complex threads at times lacks clearness. That it does is unfortunately true, and it will probably be rather as a mine of information for later historians than as a final presentation of the case that his volume will be found valuable. Indeed, many of the cross-titles that split up Dr Clyde's chapters appear to be little more than convenient headings under which he has made jottings in the course of research. Some are hardly even apposite. On p. 209 is the heading *The Licensers and Plays*. That no attempt was ever made to interfere with the printing of plays is, of course, well known, and the matter has been recently discussed at length in the *Huntington Library Bulletin*. All Dr Clyde has to say is that the licensers 'had apparently no objection to books of plays or poems even when written by confirmed royalists', and devotes the rest of the section to *Gondibert*!

The author has not been very well served by the University Press of St Andrews. The extravagant margins make the book clumsy, while the use of the same small type for the numerous quotations and for the foot-notes combines with the lack of leads separating the latter from the text to increase the sense of confusion which the difficulty of the subject and its rather disjointed treatment produce on the reader.

There is an appendix of nearly fifty pages giving texts, abstracts, or extracts of documents, and sixteen pages of index.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

*Studies in Spenser's Complaints.* By HAROLD STEIN. New York: Oxford University Press 1934. xii + 195 pp. 10s. 6d.

In this book Mr Stein gives the results of long labour on *Complaints*, omitting his studies in sources, but recording in full his conclusions on bibliography and in interpretation. His bibliographical work is exhaustive and admirable, we are grateful for his proof that the discrepancy of date between the *Muipotmos* title-page and the others is fortuitous,

and for his relegation of the Folio to its proper place. His biographical material is well arranged, and supported with that array of accurate citation so well inculcated in American institutions.

Mr Stein wisely abstains from allegorical interpretation of *Munopotmos*, and discusses the poems sensibly, out of a close acquaintance with the texts and a wide knowledge of what has been written about them. His own contribution is a theory that the last section of *Mother Hubbard's Tale* was written in 1590, and that it is connected with the succession problem, and intended to warn England of what would happen if James the Ape became king under the tutelage of Burghley the Fox. Mr Stein is happier among the certainties of bibliography than among the likelihoods of interpretation, and it might help him—and some of his countrymen—to consider the essential difference between the two processes. Rigid logic is not enough: we may as well acknowledge, all of us, that in such matters we arrive at our conclusions by aid of the imagination's working over the few (and usually undisputed) ascertained facts in the light of our general knowledge of the time, and, still more, of our general knowledge of the world, the poetic nature, and the practice of writing. We differ in *judicial* knowledge—and each of us tacitly claims superior judicial knowledge—and imaginatively, in the emphasis we place on different elements in our knowledge.

For myself, I imagine that Spenser wrote a general satire on the times, in the form of a fable, dealing in turn with Labour, Church, Court, and coming to a climax in Politics with the tale of how the Ape drugged the Lion by placing certain 'wicked herbs' under his pillow, and usurped his place until he recovered and took vengeance. Now any general satire must have particular as well as general applications to justify its generalisations—it must be *true*, and susceptible of proof. Also, any satirist is tempted by the spectacle of his dislikes. At whom, in particular, the first two sections were aimed we do not know, because no one has yet dug up particular cases of any cogency; the third probably hits at Simier and the Earl of Oxford as well as the tribe of affected courtiers in general; the fourth at Burghley, who now, for the first time, may be identified with the Fox. Who then was the Ape? It might be James, as Mr Stein argues; it might be Alençon; I am not sure that it need, *primarily*, be anyone in particular, for the story forced Spenser to carry on his Ape into this section, and his general intention held, to show what evil Ape-men and Fox-men do in the world. The last section was too bold at first, and he had to rewrite it, which obscures the whole affair, for the whole movement of Spenser's mind was thus interrupted.

As Mr Stein shows, the succession was a problem as early as 1590, but was it a burning one? Burghley was in communication with James. he was wise enough in his generation to hold insurance policies, like all the great men of Anne's time, nor was he alone in that. Whether the Ape's conduct fits even the probabilities of James's conduct is a question to be asked. Scotland supplied mercenaries to others, but employed few. The charge of cruelty is not commonly brought against James. Mr Stein produces only an obscure contemporary to say he 'bore a most cruel mind'

against certain rebellious subjects—which means, in modern phrase, that he was resentful—and it is thin evidence, in comparison with the records of Spain and Valois, against a most pacific monarch. And that is all. Mr Stein faces the more positive difficulties, but scarcely overcomes them. If James was attacked in any fashion obvious enough to be useful, why did not James complain? Mr Stein suggests that *Complaints* was kept from him. But James was a keen student of poetry, and by now Spenser was England's most conspicuous poet, *The Faerie Queene* contained offensive matter, so his other poems demanded examination, and James—notoriously—liked to do things for himself, and, unless I misjudge my compatriot, he was gey ill to keep things from I fancy Mr Stein is mistaken, he may be right, but he is not convincing.

This reads more like an article than a review, but it expresses my criticism of Mr Stein's general equipment, and exemplifies one value of his book, that its lucid statement of objective facts emphasises the importance of judicial knowledge, and sets the reader testing himself. That is no small merit, and so I continue. Mr Stein comes to no conclusion about the date of *The Teares of the Muses*, but tends, very properly, to trust the imagination of his own masters. According to him I am 'anxious' to date it 1580—I cannot say it has ever kept me awake o' nights, and that date proves nothing for me. My difficulty with the later date is, that in 1580 there was some truth in the double reproach that England was not producing good poems or notable feats of arms for poets to celebrate; in 1590 there was no truth in it, and Spenser knew it. We have to choose either Spenser was wrapped up in humanist arrogance, courteous but insincere in the lines on the poets in *Cohn Clouts Come Home Agayne*, in the reference to Watson in *The Runnes of Tyme*, in the sonnet to Howard of Effingham, and was contemptuous of such men as Winter, Grey, Drake, Hawkins, Frobisher and the rest; or *The Runnes of Tyme* was written in a fit of the blues; or it was written before that momentous decade which saw the return of Drake, the awaking of Hawkins from ten years' idleness, the adventures of the fighting Veres, the heroic death of Sidney, the raids on the Indies, the defeat of the Armada, and the emergence of Drayton, Daniel, Lodge, Greene, Peele, Marlowe, and the rest of them—that is, about the time he was saying the same things in the *October* eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender*. My imagination, aided by my feeling for style, leads me to the last alternative. Anyone is free to follow his own.

One further example: I once suggested that the first 176 lines of *The Runnes of Tyme* might be, originally, a draft of a commendatory poem to Camden. Mr Stein refutes this, on the ground that Camden is mentioned only in the last two stanzas. The mention then becomes an irrelevant side remark in passing. To me there is nothing unlikely in Spenser's commending a man whose work he quarried extensively; the lines are made out of a passage in *Britannia*; they lead up to Camden's name in a manner highly proper to such an occasion, and the obvious break in the run of the poem at lines 176–7 indicates a fresh start. One cannot argue about *The Runnes of Tyme*, but one may make out a story. A book of elegies on

Sidney was published later (tacked on to *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*), the leading contributors being Spenser, the Countess of Pembroke, and Ludovick Bryskett, but Bryskett's elegy was entered on the Stationers' Register as early as 1587, and the book may have been projected by then—Bryskett and Spenser were friends, and in Ireland together—and Bryskett's entry may have been a blocking entry such as was practised by the Chamberlain's Company. Spenser was to contribute then, and failed to keep his promise, though he may have written a scrap or two. Then, hastened at the end by Raleigh, *The Faerie Queene* was published, Ponsonby wanted more, and Spenser hastily collected some poems of various dates. These he proposed to dedicate to various lady friends, among whom he felt bound, for social and personal reasons, to include the Countess of Pembroke. But he could scarcely address her without reference to her brother and without an apology for his failure to come to the scratch along with Bryskett. Also, he was struck by the changes that had occurred since he had left England ten years before, and moved by the disappearance of all his early patrons. He had by him a draft of a commendatory poem on *Britannia*, used it to take off from (just as he used a line from *The Teares of the Muses*, which he was looking over for publication), and picked up the other scraps as he worked the thing out. Later on he hammered out *Astrophel* for Bryskett. That is a consistent story, and Mr Stein's objections to such a yarn seem to me to involve artistic and psychological difficulties greater than any it may entail. As a man of the world who has tried to write verse in his time, it strikes me as even plausible. I do not ask anyone to believe it, but I wait for somebody to produce a better one, either based on new, direct, external evidence or more satisfactory to my imagination and experience. But Mr Stein will be right in continuing to uphold his difficulties.

W. L. RENWICK.

STOCKSFIELD, NORTHUMBERLAND.

*The Works of Edmund Spenser. A Variorum Edition.* Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, C. G. OSGOOD, and F. M. PADELFORD. Vol. III. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1934. x + 432 pp. 27s.

This third volume of the monumental Johns Hopkins *Spenser* contains Book III of *The Faerie Queene*. By this time it is unnecessary to remark upon the accuracy of the text, and on the care and the learning lavished on the Notes and Appendices they go without saying.

Books III and IV are somewhat more difficult to deal with systematically than the others, for they seem less systematic in their conduct. On this it is not easy to be satisfied: whether Spenser was growing careless of form as Miss Warren says; or 'reaching out after a somewhat freer, more varied narrative plan', as Professor Dodge suggests, or was overcome by Ariosto as he hints; or was hurried by Raleigh into publishing before he had revised Book III into stricter accordance with the scheme detailed in the explanatory Letter; or whether the change does not exist at all, as Dr Padelford insists. Very possibly Dr de Selincourt is right in thinking that

the method was prescribed by the subject, which is not so much chastity as love. This was a subject on which the amorous Spenser would naturally let himself go, it is extremely complicated, and there is no *locus classicus* as there is for holiness and justice. Be that as it may, a great part of the Book is common form of romance, immediately derived in the main from Ariosto and Malory. There is more mediæval stuff in it than in the others, but it is better as a field in which to observe Spenser's interweaving of diverse materials, for some of his most notable borrowings from the classics are here also. Students of folklore might note here that when he wanted a bit of witchcraft he went to Virgil for it, all must note his open and balanced mind. The run of romantic adventure, and the straightforward illustration of pure and impure love, are broken by deliberately inserted episodes, in each of which the poet fulfils one of the ends of the epic kind as taught by the humanist critics—elaborate Description in the Mask of Cupid, delightful Invention in the Hue and Cry, History in the vision of Britomart, deep Philosophy in the Garden of Adonis. The patient skill of Spenser in linking up these episodes with the theme is worth watching, and they are more closely related in thought than appears at first sight.

To follow Spenser's mind through his labyrinth demands, here, even more alertness than usual, and for the most part the editor, Dr Greenlaw, gives good guidance. The Variorum method, however, and the polite attribution of *suum cuique*, are unhelpful in such a complicated passage as the Garden of Adonis. If, as we are told, Mr Brents Stirling has tidied it all up—a work for which we are profoundly grateful—we should have been glad to see him do it here. Having gone beyond the method by including unpublished work which the editor happens to know about, why stop there? As it is, the wise reader will disregard all that is here and await Mr Stirling's promised paper in *P.M.L.A.*<sup>1</sup> Spenser's desire to deal completely with his complex subject makes it difficult to keep an equal balance in a commentary. It is scarcely enough, for instance, to dismiss the Petrarchan passage at Canto III, 8–10, with a generalisation from Miss Janet Scott's study of *Amoretti*. Some cross-reference to the sonnets is required, and explicit citation of places in Petrarch and Tasso which Spenser certainly had in mind, for by that obvious imitation he was introducing another phase of love. Venus's *mantle, colour'd like the starry skyes*, which passes without note, is the *Venus mantle lynyed with Starrs* of the *View of Ireland*; where Spenser got it I do not know, though I should like to, but it is a good example of Spenser's thoroughness in getting up his subject. It is not enough, again, to quote without examination. Upton thought the ermine in Artegall's arms a canting reference to Grey; but *gris* is not *ermine*. Possibly the propriety of the ermine might be its hint at the fastidiousness which (in my reading of his character) was one reason for Grey's ill success in Ireland. Grey's real arms might have been cited to save confusion in young minds; so also, when an actual (but lost) shield of Sir John Scudamore is mentioned *à propos* of Scudamour's arms, it might be well to mention also the Scudamore stirrups. Spenser

<sup>1</sup> Since published.

was not blazoning real arms, and negative evidence has its uses. The unevenness of the notes is conspicuous in those on the commendatory poems and dedicatory sonnets. Why a reprint of the second edition should contain these at the place they occupied only in the first edition is not clear, especially when the Letter to Raleigh was (very wisely) placed with Book 1. Since they are here, it is natural to ask who were these people, and why did Spenser trouble to compliment them? The question is the more cogent as the answers vary. Space for some of this might be gained by omitting the six citations regarding Raleigh's sonnet, which all say merely that the sonnet is a good sonnet.

Turning to the Appendices that on the Plan and Conduct of the Book contains some good mixed reading, mainly about its subject. It is interesting to find the Appendix on the Historical Allegory so bald and unconvincing. The theme of the book scarcely involves conspicuous historical incident on the national scale, but requires the method of *roman à clef*, drawing for illustrative material on personal history and private life. One suspects, here and there, reminiscences, gossip, things not recorded in the history books, and feels that much is lost which we should have known if the English had had the excellent French habit of writing memoirs. As it is, we may glean fragments from letters in the P.R.O. and from such things as ambassadorial reports. One example need scarcely have been missed here: the fight of Timias at the ford is Spenser's version of a well-known adventure of Raleigh's, which might have been cited, if not from the original documents, then from Mr Milton Waldman's *Life of Raleigh*—correcting Mr Waldman's comic transformation of Raleigh's *horseman's staff* into *quarterstaff*. Thus a neat opportunity is missed of exemplifying Spenser's method: it is a good story, a topical allusion and a friendly compliment, and a moral allegory all at the same time.

I hope that the last volume may contain an essay by one of the editors, drawing the main lines of Spenser's thought clearly and as simply as may be. The Variorum method necessarily creates an impression of dishevelment and unevenness, and the editors of this edition ought to be the men to remove it.

W. L. RENWICK.

STOCKSFIELD, NORTHUMBERLAND.

*The Axiochus of Plato.* Translated by EDMUND SPENSER. Edited by FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFOED. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. London. H. Milford. 1934. 80 pp. 12s. 6d.

The evidence for assigning this work to Edmund Spenser amounts, perhaps, to seventy per cent. Professor Padelfoed's edition is based on a copy bound up in a 1679 Spenser Folio offered for sale by W. Heffer and Sons in 1931. The text was printed by Cuthbert Burbie in 1592 as '*Axiochus*. A most excellent Dialogue, written in Greeke by *Plato* . . . Translated out of Greeke by Edw. Spenser', with the addition (now missing) of 'A sweet speech. . . at the Tryumphe at White-hall before her Maiestie by the Page to the right noble Earle of Oxenforde'. It is men-

tioned in Thomas Osborne's *Catalogus Bibliothecae Harleianae* (1744), where it is still assigned to 'Edw Spenser'. John Upton, however, in the preface to his edition of *The Faerie Queene*, states his intention of including in a third volume a translation of the *Axiarchus* by Edmund Spenser unnoticed by any of Spenser's previous editors. This project was never carried out, and the next reference to the translation as the work of the poet occurs in the list of 'Ancient Translations from Classic Authors' incorporated in Steevens' edition of Shakespeare (1773). Todd, in his edition of Spenser, mentions the translation as a work which he has failed to obtain; and subsequent references in Malone's *Shakespeare*, J. Payne Collier's *Spenser*, the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, and F. I. Carpenter's *Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser* tell the same tale.

In assuming 'Edw' to be a misprint for 'Edm', therefore, Upton gave a lead to all subsequent editors, who assigned the translation to the poet without having seen the original, but Upton's assumption is supported by this inclusion of the text in at least one copy of the 1679 Folio and by significant parallelism between the language of the translation and that of Spenser's authentic works. By a careful collation of variant versions Professor Padelford shows that the translator used the text of Welsdalius, relying upon Latin rather than Greek. If the version is Spenser's it should probably be included among the juvenile works in which he was engaged during the years immediately preceding his departure to Ireland. The lack of any reference to the translation in the Spenser-Harvey correspondence and in Ponsonby's enumeration of Spenser's lost works render the evidence for amending Burbie's title-page still inconclusive. But we are none the less grateful to Professor Padelford for bringing to light a work of such interest and to the Johns Hopkins Press for their admirable reproduction of the text in facsimile.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

LONDON.

*Corpus Hamleticum. Hamlet in Sage und Dichtung, Kunst und Musik.*  
Hrsg. von J. SCHICK. 1 Abteilung *Sagengeschichtliche Untersuchungen*.  
4. Band. *Die Scharfsinnsproben*. 1. Teil. *Der fernere Orient*. Leipzig:  
Otto Harrassowitz. 1934. xii + 450 pp.

Professor Schick has made a change in the order of the parts of his great work (see previous notices, *Mod. Lang. Rev.* VIII, p. 569; xxviii, p. 515), and the fourth volume dealing with 'Scharfsinnsproben', examples of extraordinary insight and crafty induction, is given us before the second which should complete the story of 'Das Gluckskind mit dem Todesbrief' and which we hope is merely postponed. The stories with which we are now occupied have a less close connexion with Shakespeare's *Hamlet* than with the ruder form of the Hamlet saga found in Saxo Grammaticus, who tells how the King of England was so much impressed by Amlethus' conduct, in refusing the food set before him at the Court and detecting the King's bastardy, that he conceived a high regard for him and gave him

his daughter in marriage. But the story of Amlethus' crafty insight into buried secrets proves to be no more an isolated tale than were those we encountered in the 'Glückskind' collection, and we shall see that research has brought to light countless analogues of it (and related tales of rare acuteness in detecting the traces of an elephant or a camel) in the literatures of India and Arabia, of the Jews and the Chinese.

It was first noticed that Hamlet's remarkable detection of the King's bastardy is found thrice in the *Arabian Nights* in those tales which Edward Wortley Montagu brought to Europe (supplementary to Galland's edition of the *Nights* which does not contain it) and which were translated by Capt Jonathan Scott in 1811. Dunlop, in his *History of Fiction*, 1814, saw the resemblance of three Italian stories to some of those in Scott's edition. Joseph von Hammel in 1818 found the same stories in Persian and recognised in them the source of Voltaire's *Zadig*, while Echtermeyer and Simrock in 1851, guided by Dunlop, saw the connexion between the Oriental and Italian stories and those of the Northern Amlethus. Other contributions were made by L Deslongchamps in 1865 and by Benfey in 1859 and 1864. S. Frankel, *Die Scharfsinnsproben*, 1890, argues that the Arabian stories were earlier than the Indian, but a Chinese version unknown to him shows that the Indian elephant stories preceded the Arabian stories of the camel. This is proved again and again in Schick's work. Articles by Schiefner in 1859 and 1875-8 had called attention to a fresh source in the literature of Tibet which was made more widely known by Ralston in his *Tibetan Tales*, 1906.

Only at a late date was attention centred on the Hamlet story from the Germanic side in the 1894 volume of A. Olrik's *Marchen in Saxo Grammaticus* and P. Hermann's *Dre Heldensagen des Saxo Grammaticus*, 1922. Elton's translation of *Saxo Grammaticus* and Gollancz's *Hamlet in Iceland* showed England's participation in the quest.

Professor Schick's careful collation of the work of his predecessors, of which this is a very rough summary, has made his main task easier, and he now writes

Based on these abundant works of my forerunners, the attempt will be made in this volume to sift and arrange the whole material of the Hamletic and nearly related proofs of extraordinary sagacity, and then so far as the powers of author, printer and finance-minister allow, to publish them in their original tongues, and also as far as possible trace the paths of their wanderings and the complicated nature of their connexion and filiation, not merely down to Saxo Grammaticus but to our own day, in which these children of poetical feeling and shifting fancy are in danger of being stifled in an inglorious death.

The volume before us is another proof of the extraordinary critical and linguistic powers Professor Schick devotes to his task. May they enable him to bring it to a triumphant end while some of us are still alive!

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.



*John Florio, the life of an Italian in Shakespeare's England* By FRANCES A. YATES. Cambridge: University Press 1934. 364 pp. 15s

Miss Yates has given us a valuable book upon one who was himself an outstanding literary figure in Shakespeare's day and, being for some half a dozen years the tutor of Shakespeare's patron, was probably well known personally to the dramatist. His figure has hitherto attracted much speculation, Miss Yates, while not eschewing speculation, has established many new facts. She promises to follow the volume up with another, dealing expressly with Florio's relation to Shakespeare. If that be as good as this, it should prove a very interesting book indeed. In any event, she has succeeded in piecing together several pretty little corners of the jigsaw of Elizabethan literary history.

Her findings, indeed, are by no means confined to Shakespearean matters. It is one of the virtues of the book that it touches Tudor England at so many points and illuminates all that it touches. The opening chapter, for example, on Florio's father, an Italian Protestant, who fled from the Inquisition, became preacher of 'the church of the Italians' in London c. 1551, got into trouble for some act of seeming immorality (which may have been nothing more than a theological crotchet concerning the relations between the sexes), was nevertheless appointed Italian tutor to Lady Jane Grey and perhaps also to the Princess Elizabeth, fled for his life a second time on the accession of 'that impious, cruel, brazen Jezebel' Queen Mary, and finally settled down as pastor of Sogho in Grissons, gives us a most suggestive glimpse both of Europe and of London at the time of Edward VI. Even more important is a later chapter headed 'Florio and Bruno' in which Miss Yates throws fresh light upon the Nolan's residence in England and upon his connexion with Sidney and the Areopagus on the one hand and with Raleigh and the School of Night on the other. Florio, moreover, the author of *First Fruits* (1578), *Second Fruits* (1591), *A World of Words* (1598), and *The Essays of Montaigne* (1603), was far the most eminent of the many foreign exiles in London, at the end of the sixteenth century, who made their living by teaching modern languages and compiling manuals of instruction. Miss Yates, accordingly, introduces us to this circle, and demonstrates that John Eliot's *Ortho-epia Gallica* (1593) was an attack by an English hater of foreigners upon the pack of them in general and upon Florio in particular. Further, she establishes a connexion between this Eliot and Gabriel Harvey, shows good reason for thinking that the unnamed critic of Nashe, spoken of in *Pierce's Supererogation*, was Eliot himself, and hints that the '*Ortho-epia Gallica*, and the circumstances leading up to it, will prove to be a highly important clue to the topicalities of *Love's Labour's Lost*'. Finally, in a fascinating chapter upon Henry Sanford, the tutor and secretary to William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, she proves not only that Florio and Nashe were united in express dislike for this man, but throws a good deal of fresh light upon the problem of the publication of the second edition of *Arcadia* in 1593. All this is accompanied with much subsidiary speculation, some of it rather risky

in character, but unless I am mistaken the main framework of her theories will stand the test of time.

The weakest parts of the book, to my mind, are those which seek to connect Florio with the system of government espionage in which Marlowe became involved to his undoing. The claim, for instance, that Florio was an agent of Walsingham's, and that he acted as a spy while he resided at the French Embassy is ingenious, but rests upon very slender evidence, which when scrutinised seems to consist of nothing more than an obscure reference to him in William Vaughan's *Golden Fleece* published in 1626! Vaughan's words clearly point to anti-papal activity on Florio's part, which is natural enough in the son of his father, but when Vaughan bids him repair, with Robert Burton, to 'your friend Master Secretarie Walsingham' for a warrant against Mariana the Jesuit, the fact that Burton (as Miss Yates herself notes) was only fourteen years old at Walsingham's death surely indicates that the name Walsingham is merely being used by Vaughan as a cloak for some other anti-papal statesman alive at the time and therefore dangerous to mention directly; in a word, it proves no connexion with Walsingham at all. Equally slender, I think, is her suggestion that Florio was a spy of the Cecils while acting as tutor to the Earl of Southampton. 'Much of this', she admits, 'is suspicion only.... But this suspicion weakens the positive statement that Shakespeare could not have laughed at Florio in his plays, because the Italian was tutor to his friend and patron, Southampton. Southampton might have had reasons for distrusting Florio whilst fearing to get rid of him.' I find it very difficult to reconcile such suspicions with Florio's 'resolute' behaviour in regard to the Danvers case, still less with the tone of the dedication and sonnet prefixed to the *World of Words* in 1598 when he was no longer in Southampton's service. We shall doubtless hear more of all this in Miss Yates's second book. Meanwhile, do not her suspicions look a little like manoeuvring for position? Surely, the ascertained and irrefutable facts being what they are, the burden of proof lies upon those who see Florio's features in those of Holofernes.

That there is some connexion between Florio and *Love's Labour's Lost* seems likely enough, inasmuch as the point of Shakespeare's title becomes clear in the light of the following sentence from *First Fruits* (1578):

We neede not speak so much of loue, al books are ful of loue, with so many authors, that it were labour lost to speake of Loue

These words, however, do nothing to class Florio with the contemners of love and the School of Night fifteen years later; for, as Miss Yates writes.

There is a marked change in tone between the *First Fruits* and the *Second Fruits*. The latter contains little trace of the moralising of the earlier dialogues. Instead of spending much of their time in exchanging improving precepts and in commenting on the wickedness of the world, the speakers in the *Second Fruits* lead quite gay lives. They play tennis, chess, backgammon, go hunting, attend a banquet.... The conversation between James and Lippa his man abounds in 'delightsome iestes' of a somewhat licentious character. But most striking of all is Florio's change from the attitude indicated by the remark, 'it were labour lost to speake of Loue', to that suggested by the fact that he fills nearly a quarter of the *Second Fruits* with a long and detailed discussion of this very topic.

Clearly in 1591, when *Second Fruits* was published, Florio was in a mood to appreciate, or at the least not to decry, Berowne's defence of ladies' bright eyes.

I make these points, not because I have any preconceived theory of my own about *Love's Labour's Lost*, but because I want them answered; because, in a word, I look forward with keen anticipation to the promised sequel of this admirable book.

J. DOVER WILSON

PURIFY.

*The Early Career of Alexander Pope.* By GEORGE SHERBURN. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1934. viii + 326 pp 15s

This is an exceptional biography. It is the work of a man well acquainted with recent research in the eighteenth century, who has contributed a number of interesting facts to the life of Pope from his own investigations, interpreted them convincingly, and told his story supremely well. Perhaps only those who have attempted to pick their way through the mass of contradicting and slanderous statements which were circulated about Pope and his friends by their contemporaries will fully appreciate Professor Sherburn's treatment of his material and the lucidity of his narrative. His command is as successful and as impressive as that sublime angel's who rode in the whirlwind and directed the storm.

The book is primarily a documented narrative of Pope's early career, and only secondarily a collection of all available material. There is not much that Professor Sherburn misses out, but those who want to know how far Pope was affected by the South Sea Bubble, or what little there is to be known about Pope's tenure of his villa at Twickenham, must return to the fifth volume of Elwin and Courthope's edition of the works. On the other hand, Professor Sherburn has written the fullest and clearest account of Pope's early relations with Dennis, Curll, and Addison. Unfortunately, since the biography stops short at 1727, these are incomplete; Pope's reconciliation with Dennis came in 1733, and the real fun with Curll did not start till some two years later. But what remains to finish the story of Pope's relations with Addison is so small, that it might well have been included. Professor Sherburn does not comment on the insertion of the verse character of Addison into the *Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot*. What led Pope to make use of these lines once more after he had already printed them as his own in the *Miscellanies*? What effect was intended by changing the name to *Atticus* and omitting the couplet 'Who when two wits, etc.'? Is it possible that Pope believed that he was 'Theophrastanising' the character, that the character, already so well known, was unrecognisable after this change, in spite of the references to *Cato* and to the Turk (see *Spectator*, No. 253) which lose their significance unless we remember the particular man for whom they were intended? Professor Sherburn's comments on these points would be welcome.

No one interested in Pope and Addison should neglect to consider Professor Sherburn's reassessment of their characters. In the Homer

business, Addison's motives appear rather more dubious and Pope's rather less dubious than earlier critics supposed, judging from insufficient evidence. In Pope Professor Sherburn can find no malice or depravity, but he passes judgment on his sensitiveness to attack and recklessness in reply. A biographer of Pope must necessarily concern himself with Pope's morals, so much abused in his own time and since, for it was in them that Pope took so much pride, and in them that he found the inspiration of so much of his later poetry. This will concern Professor Sherburn even more in his second volume—which is eagerly and confidently expected. Professor Sherburn makes no promises, but we suppose he can scarcely leave Pope in the last sentence of this book, entering 'upon a more brilliant and important phase of his career' without proceeding to expound it. At least we hope he will not leave him here.

Two omissions from the index have been noticed. There is no reference to Mr Ault's name, which appears in a note on p. 208, and a reference to the Pope-Swift *Miscellanies* on p. 146 is unrecorded.

JOHN BUTT.

LONDON

*The Monthly Review First Series, 1749–1789 Indexes of Contributors and Articles.* By BENJAMIN CHRISTIE NANGLE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1934. xvi + 256 pp. 15s

Any notice of this volume must at some point include a tribute to the enthusiasm and persistency of the compiler, and it is pleasant to acknowledge at the outset the indebtedness under which Dr Nangle has placed all serious students of later eighteenth-century literature. A more tangible acknowledgment of the value of his labour must be that the book will automatically take its place upon the shelves of every reference library.

Dr Nangle's preface contains a complete vindication of the character and editorial policy of Ralph Griffiths against the charges brought by Forster in his *Life and Times of Oliver Goldsmith* (1848). Contemporary evidence is quoted to show that Griffiths, during the fifty-four years of his editorship (1749–1803), was the exact reverse of Forster's mean-spirited slave-driver in his relations with his reviewers. Although he centralised control of the *Review* in himself and took full responsibility for the opinions expressed therein, Griffiths was enlightened enough to distribute his reviewing among carefully chosen experts, who were generously remunerated. 'The miserable hacks of legend thus prove to be in fact among the most eminent scholars in the kingdom'; and, thanks to the editor's policy of complete anonymity, men of all ranks, professions and parties were willing to contribute to his pages. From all he demanded the strictest honesty and impartiality. Rather than accept a review biased by personal favour or resentment, he would sever connexions with the reviewer.

In Dr Nangle's annotated Index of Contributors all ascriptions of authorship are based upon the evidence of Griffiths's own file of the

periodical (now in the Bodleian), in which he appended to each article the writer's initials or an abbreviation of his name. The task of expanding these proved far from easy, in spite of the help afforded by Griffiths's correspondence, but Dr Nangle has in most cases established his identifications, and, where doubt still exists, he is at pains to indicate the fact. Clearly the great value of this index, which no student of the period can afford to neglect, lies in its augmentation of the canon of many a well-known author's writings. The Indexes of Articles (Main Articles, Monthly Catalogues, Foreign Literature, and Correspondence) enable one to tell at a glance whether any important publication was reviewed in this periodical, and, if so, where and by whom. The saving of time and trouble which this makes possible will be appreciated by all who have occasion to consult the Review.

The present volume, ample though it is, covers only the First Series, 1749-89. One gathers that Dr Nangle intends to pursue his study through the later series. So generous an undertaking should meet with every encouragement.

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

*Primitivism and the Idea of Progress in English Popular Literature of the Eighteenth Century.* By LOIS WHITNEY. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford. 1934. xxi + 343 pp. 12s. 6d.

Professor Whitney's volume is based on an attempt 'to see what the history of ideas of the eighteenth century would look like if it were written, not in terms of what the philosophers actually said, but in terms of what the public thought they said'; in especial, to examine the antagonistic notions of primitivism and progress as expounded in popular literature between 1750 and 1815. As far as it is possible when dealing with writers who frequently combine wholly opposed points of view in the same sentence, Professor Whitney treats of primitivism and progress separately. Her studies of their philosophical background occupy a third of the space and perhaps a larger proportion of the interest of her book. In discussing the primitivists she shows clearly that their idealisation of the noble savage and their harping on the continuous degeneration of mankind represented, in the economic sphere, their conservative protest against the spread of luxury as a concomitant of national prosperity. In the moral sphere, they move from an originally rationalistic basis into anti-rationalistic worship of sensibility, wherein emotion and instinct are made the only sure guides to action. In opposition to this search for perfection by an impossible retrogression, there developed the more positive cult of perfection by progress, evolutionary or revolutionary. Common to both was the belief that the perfect state could be achieved; and this probably accounts for the co-existence of both primitivistic and progressive ideas in some of these writers. Professor Whitney is to be congratulated on her skilful disentangling of their arguments and her success in isolating the major principles of the two groups.

Professor Whitney has drawn the greater part of her material from the writings of minor novelists, political propagandists, and educationists. The fact that some of those whom she has exhumed for a post-mortem of their philosophy were no more consistent or illuminating than their modern equivalents might be in expounding the quantum theory is no argument against their potential influence in their own day. Taken as a body they probably provide a reliable guide to popular thought in an age of social, economic and political transition. In charity to the age, however, one must believe that a few of them were merely muddle-headed cranks speaking for themselves alone; their one useful function was to serve as the butt of some vigorous satire.

Professor Whitney's reluctance to encroach on other studies already published or in preparation and her tendency to identify 'popular' literature exclusively with 'minor' literature have led to certain curious omissions. For example, an excellent discussion of the principles of Godwin, Holcroft and Mary Wollstonecraft contains no reference to their affinities with Wordsworth, Coleridge, Blake and Southey. Attention might also be called to the incompleteness of the index, where such names as Wordsworth, Coleridge and Lamb do not appear, although they are each mentioned twice in the text. Such faults as the misspelling of Sterne's Christian name as 'Lawrence' in text and index and the constant use of 'an ethics' cannot be accidental.

F. E. BUDD.

LONDON.

*The Aesthetics of William Hazlitt.* By ELIZABETH SCHNEIDER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: H. Milford. 1933 viii + 200 pp 8s. 6d.

*Reason and Beauty in the Poetic Mind.* By CHARLES WILLIAMS. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1933. vii + 186 pp. 6s.

The first business of anyone who sets out to discuss the aesthetics of Hazlitt is to convince sceptical readers that he has any aesthetics to discuss. Most people have assumed (too readily, as Miss Schneider shows in her clear and careful study) that Hazlitt's literary and artistic criticism was purely intuitive and *ad hoc*, and that his individual judgments could not be related to any consistent system of critical principles. Miss Schneider claims for him that he was 'a philosophical thinker in his own right', and, as she adds, this can hardly be said of any other great English critic except Coleridge. She admits that Hazlitt's aesthetic principles were never reduced by him to a coherent system, but in the course of her thorough and sympathetic inquiry she does very nearly succeed in doing for him what he never did for himself. Dealing with his incidental pronouncements on such matters as the ideal, the imitation of Nature, selection, beauty, she makes him a philosopher almost in spite of himself, and finds the key to most of his characteristic beliefs in his pluralism. For him the reconciliation of self with other is achieved 'not through

assimilation of all *other* into the *self*, but through the projecting of *self* into all *other*'.

What Miss Schneider attempts she achieves. Mr Williams, flying at rather bigger game, has written a series of chapters on poetry and the poetic mind which are full of interesting points, but which will almost certainly leave most readers in a state of confusion. Read as a series of isolated essays, the chapters of his book are often illuminating on individual poems or poets read as the progressive stages of an argument, they become at times almost incomprehensible. One hesitates to accuse Mr Williams of mere literary-philosophical table-talk, but some part of the difficulty with which his readers have to contend seems to be due to a lack of method in the author, and a willingness to digress. In his Preface he speaks of 'the four corners of this book', and then, having added to those 'four middle points', he suggests that 'the ground plan will be sufficiently marked'. That may be, but is it a good ground plan? The intellectual edifice which Mr Williams has raised is of the Gothic order, with one or two impressive vistas, some quaint and curious intellectual carving, and one or two very dim-discovered spires. Let him enjoy it who may: this book may have fallen into the hands of the wrong reader.

J. R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON

*The Trend of Modern Poetry.* By GEOFFREY BULLOUGH. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd 1934. vii + 181 pp. 5s.

In eight short chapters, each accompanied by a select bibliography, Professor Bullough surveys modern poetry from Thomas Hardy to Mr Day Lewis. More than fifty poets are classified and appreciated in this short space, it is a considerable feat, but the nature of the enterprise has certain drawbacks. The book suffers inevitably from a lack of perspective. Mr W. B. Yeats receives only the same impartial, deferential attention as Miss Edith Sitwell or Mr Robert Graves. There is nothing in the book to indicate that he is a giant among pigmies. Kinds are carefully distinguished but, because each poet must receive space enough for his wares to be described, it seems as though such writers as Mr de la Mare and Mr Masfield or Mr Eliot and Mr Herbert Read were of much the same importance as poets. It is not that Professor Bullough refrains altogether from expressing judgments. Of Lawrence he writes 'Despite his occasional turgidity, hysteria, crudities, imitations of Whitman's barbaric yawp, he was a great poet', of Mr Robert Graves: 'His mental growth as much as his poetic accomplishment makes him one of the most interesting of living poets'; and of Mr Eliot's *Waste Land* that it 'comes near to being a great poem'. But the determination to be fair and to be thorough, to omit no one who can possibly be thought to deserve attention, and to attend as carefully to one kind of poet as to another, leaves an impression that all are of much the same stature.

Professor Bullough makes some surprising comparisons which, again owing to his restricted space, he has no room to elaborate or defend.

'*A Child's Garden of Verses* is a necessary link between Blake, Christina Rossetti and Mr de la Mare, for Stevenson had an insight into the simpler moods of children lacking in his predecessors' (p. 8), or, on p. 33, an assertion that Mr Yeats in his later poetry achieves 'a simplicity and correctness whose nearest parallel is Ben Jonson', or, on p. 5, 'Mr Housman used the pastoral, like Marvell, for meditation on the ephemerality and dissatisfaction of life'. These relationships are far from self-evident, yet they are left as bare statements without support or qualification.

But, despite the drawbacks inherent in such an attempt, Professor Bullough has compiled a work of reference that will serve a purpose. The would-be traveller in these modern 'realms of gold' will find here an impartial description of the land he wishes to explore. There is much to be said for embarking on the journey without prejudice, armed with a guide book from which none of the sights are omitted. In the long run, after all, we shall each return to those of our own choosing.

JOAN BENNETT.

CAMBRIDGE.

*Gui de Warewic*. Roman du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle édité par ALFRED EWERT. Tomes I, II. (Classiques Français du Moyen Âge, 74, 75) Paris: Champion. 1933. xxxvi+207; 223 pp. 34 fr. 50.

It is a fine achievement to have produced a usable edition of *Gui de Warewic*. For something like a hundred years one scholar after another has treated one aspect or other of the subject and many have been the projects of publication. One scholar of Anglo-Norman, Professor Vising, who more than fifty years ago showed the metrical diversity of its manuscript readings, has lived to write an appreciative review of what he must hardly have hoped to see (*Medieval Aevum*, III, pp. 217 seq., 1934). It is also a great pleasure to find in the now lengthy series of 'Classiques Français du Moyen Âge' a long poem in the French of our island. Living within a mile or so of the supposed manor of Walthoof, the present reviewer would like to see the romance of *Waldef* become accessible also to modern readers.

*Guy de Warewic*, despite its extreme prolixity (12926 ll.) enjoyed extraordinary popularity, due not merely to the fact that Guy becomes the saviour of his country, but because the romance combines most of the important poetic themes of the Middle Ages. We have the young squire, mad like Amadas with love for his liege lord's daughter, performing mighty deeds to deserve her love—this provides the major theme; there is also the friendship theme—Guy and Terry like Ami and Amile, the theme of uxoriousness like that of Erec and Yvain in Chrétien de Troyes, the retirement to a monastery like William of Orange or Ogier the Dane; the return of the hero disguised as a pilgrim to live unknown on his relatives' charity, like St Alexis, and, interspersed, all the fairy themes of slain dragons, faithful lions, enchanted castles, rescues from robbers, not omitting kidnappings and imprisonments in Saracen dungeons; terrific



single combats with items borrowed from the classic fight of Roland and Oliver (from *Girard de Vienne*, of which there is probably also another reminiscence in the ambushade of ll 2505 *seq.*), William's fight with Corolt, the deeds of the Four Sons of Aymon, the ubiquity of Oberon, descriptions of palaces reminiscent of the Romances of *Eneas*, *Thebes* and *Troy*, games of chess, tents and pavilions and dragon standards from the epics (cf. *Roland*, 3545), all the matter in short which was to form the staple of the long romances of Middle English.

The author, writing doubtless as Professor Ewert suggests about 1240, knew well the current literature of his time, and borrows from it without reserve. One condition, however, of taking *son bien où on le trouve* is to weld it into a personal and harmonious whole, this our author did not know how to do, one must confess that to read carefully the 12926 lines is for us to-day rather a tedious task. Nor are we rewarded by a number of contemporary references which might supply the reader with some facts of thirteenth-century life, the mention of the *communes* (1964, 6165) who had won renown by steadiness shown at the battle of Bouvines (1214), the idea of defending a town by holding strongly its approaches (3453 *seq.*) and suggested by Villehardouin, the translation of the holy body of a saint to a distant abbey (11643–56), these seem the only obvious references to contemporary events, apart from the ordinary mediæval atmosphere.

But Professor Ewert has done his part admirably, with so many MSS. in being he has wisely refused to attempt a 'critical' text, he has taken what he felt to be the best MS. and the one nearest to the date of authorship, and in *Notes critiques* supplies variants and critical matter. There is a full introduction, the list of names is complete and the glossary is excellent, a section which in this series is so often lamentably inadequate.

The MS. chosen is that of the British Museum, Additional 38662, in private hands till about twenty years ago and called in this edition E from a former owner Sir Henry Hope Edwardes; it is obviously the best and probably the oldest. Professor Ewert has transcribed it with extreme care, and in the 1400 lines which I have been able to check there are—except for changes explained in the introduction or notes—only one omission, *se* before *sest* (752, an omission which does not harm the sense) and one misreading, *ferai* (952) for *fiar* of the MS.

The scrupulous acceptance of the *ipsissima verba* of the MS. results in a very imperfect text judged from the standpoint of continental romances in octosyllabic form. Professor Ewert recognises this and remarks that while remaining faithful to his principle of making as few changes as possible, he feels nevertheless constrained after following his scribe in his work through several thousand lines, to 'réparer les blessures qu'il a fait subir à son texte' (p. xxix). The longest list of these 'mutilations' is concerned with probable omissions; most of the suggested emendations seem to the present reviewer to be extremely probable, but the method of notifying them is very inconvenient. This is not the fault of the editor but of the method of the whole series. On p. xxx (vol. I) some 70 numbers of catalectic lines are given; it is necessary first to turn to the *Notes critiques* in vol. II and to see what is the reading of MS. E and then to turn to the

line of the text and to find out how the change proposed by the editor fits in e.g., ll. 4037–8 in MS. E read *De totes parz l'unt assaillu, Mais cum ber se defendi*. The proposal is to add *ul* after *Mais*. It would seem preferable in the case of small changes of this kind to insert the word in brackets.

It must have been a very delicate matter to decide where these reparations should cease, there are in the text of E dozens of lines where some small emendation, addition or deletion of a common word or form restores both good grammar and good scansion. If the line of E, *A la terre morz abatus* (1850) is properly altered to *E a la terre morz abatus*, one does not quite see why the same treatment should not be applied to l. 569 which reads *Mult grant pitié li en prist*. One might think also that l. 346 *Que jo seie vostre amie* would be improved by emending *la vostre amie*, a use to be found not 20 lines before. It is on a system like this that the Picard *remaniement* of the Anglo-Norman *Amadas et Ydoine* proceeds in a great number of cases, e.g., Anglo-Norman version: *Uns dux de noble parage*; Picard version *Uns dus de mult noble parage* (see the edition of *Amads et Ydoine*, No 51 of the same series)

There is another category for which the editor allows himself some departure from his strict rule (p. xxxi, par. 4), viz. when a final vowel is dropped; perhaps it is a simple lapsus that l. 10936 reads *Ço vos mand li reis Jhesu*.

In a text of this length one would expect to find a considerable number of interesting words, forms or phrases, these seem, however, few. One may mention *turner le foul* (398), used also in *Athis et Porphilas* (3099), and two other examples only in Godefroy, iv, 169 c, *recoullir druerie* (947), *se colpler* (1345), *mettre en vere d'aloec* (572), *loer conseil* (1750) compared with *doner conseil* (1762)—the first might seem to be incorrect, as the line is perhaps faulty and the phrase tautological, but it occurs again in l. 2620 *Dreit* as an adverb seems fairly rare, there are only three examples in Godefroy and one in *Erec* (2865), *Qui bien le sot dreit envair*, with *venir* it is found often enough. In combination with prepositions *droit* is common however, e.g., *droit a* (Alexis three times and here 7731), also *dreit de* (2897), *droit en*, *d. vers*, *d. sour*, *tout droit* is also so common that one may ask if this reading should not be adopted for l. 452, one would perhaps prefer to emend, *L'amur n'est pas dreit departre* (cf. *bersiers*, *biens departir*, *Yvan* (2626, 5346)), since uncertainty about prefixes is one of the weaknesses of Anglo-Norman scribes.

Other interesting words are *cembel* (11960) which seems to be used like 'ensign' for a subaltern; *chalit*, modern French *châlit*. *chevalier du pavement* (469), 'escort'; *deboter* (10125), 'toss about', used of the sea in a similar passage of the *Vie du pape Grégoire*, *engarde* (12605), 'outpost', *s'entrenaffrer* (12034), only a later example of the reflexive use in Godefroy, *falsart* (11930), 'pike', *hançat* (6981), 'dagger'; *recetter* (12218), lost in French but kept in Italian 'ricettare'. There is also a very frequent use made of the phrase *ne vos tamez* reminiscent of the biblical *noli (nolite) temere*, otherwise *timere* and *timor* have few descendants in French (cf. *Romania*, LIV, p. 110).

The author of *Gui* uses *enveit* as the 3rd sing. of *enverer* several times in

rime with *avert*, *deit* (471, 3147), he has many times *remis* instead of *remés* from *remansum* riming with *ocis* (11337), *pars* (6445) and also *remist* (12585). He has the rare form *esquesche* (: *danesche* (3583)), the 3rd sing. of *cachier* is found in rime with the outcome of *sicca* (*Ysopet de Lyon*, cf. T L. s.v.) and various forms with an *i* or *e* are quoted in Godefroy under *escachner*. A peculiarity of the text seems to be the frequent use of *dun*, *dune* as a kind of negative interrogative particle, but the negative sense is not always quite obvious, e.g., *Estes vus dun de rien marri?* The author also uses *loinz* to a degree which seems excessive, e.g., *Loinz del cheval l'a abatu* (885, 888), altogether some 30 times.

There are in the text a very large number of instances in which the future of *voulour* with the infinitive seems to express little more than the future sense, this phenomenon, since Burghardt's *Ueber den Einfluss des Englischen auf das Anglonormannische*, has generally been accepted as a peculiarity of Anglo-Norman, it is, however, not solely to be found in Anglo-Norman, e.g., *Cristal et Clarie: Et Cristal se prist a penser, Que il se voldra desarmer* (8213), and in *Raoul de Cambray: Devant l'autel faites aparillier Un riche li ou me volrar couchier* (1238), *N'est pas merveille s'or me vuel corecier: Il sont mi oncle, je lor volrar aidier* (1649). The use or abuse of the construction seems to spring from cases where the use of the auxiliary is reasonable, e.g., *En Alemagne voldrar aler, Al riche empereur Reiner* (3299), and then developed into uses where the simple future might be preferable, e.g., *Al soldain voldrar mander Qu'a tort me volt desheriter* (3749) or *Mars a la mer dreit s'en ala, En Jerusalem puis aler voldra* (7732). With other tenses the use of *vuler* seems not abnormal, e.g., *(Que) le bon brant ne volt obher* seems to be matched by *Mot ot li mestre Tristan chier, Quant il son brant ne vout larsier* (Bérout's *Tristan*, 971) or even by *Chanson de Roland: Aler i volt, sin durrat a Rollant* (2226) and again in *Raoul de Cambray* (cf. editor's remark in glossary). Dialects far from this island have similar uses. *Or nos estuet a ce atroundre, Et quant la barbe lor vuet poundre, Lors les doit on cheveliers faire* (*Li Abreiance de l'ordre de chevalerie* by Jean Priorat de Besançon, 463). The use persists still in Franche-Comté where 'It's going to thunder' and 'there will be thunder later on' are differentiated by 'il va tonner' and 'il veut tonner' (F. Boillot, *Le Français régional de la Grand'Combe*, p. 300).

Everyone who has edited a work written in this country has had to consider the irritating question of Anglo-French versification. It is difficult to understand how an author who, from what has been said about his sources, must have been widely read in the continental romances, can write so many metrically irregular lines. Why is it that in speeches or monologues (e.g., 441-56, 575-82, 617-28, 927-42, etc.) only a small change here and there would produce lines permissible in normal French and then follow lines that seem irremediable? We must allow for the extra syllable at the cesura (cf. ll. 435, 447, 540, 542, 550, 6432); the counting of feminine *e* (e.g., ll. 494, 546) or its omission (e.g., ll. 491, 492, etc.), the wide use of hiatus (cf. the lengthy work of Rydberg, *Die Entwicklung des frz. e*), and what is then left must somehow be explained by English habits of intonation or stress.

The correction of the proofs must have been done with the greatest care, only the following seem to call for notice: a comma misplaced in l. 9877 and perhaps *ls* for *li* in l. 11273. other items: *lu* (= *leu*, cf. Suchier *Boeve de Haumtone*, p. 204) (798), *na* (= *ne*) (2568), *bliand* (2691), *chvoils* (3994) are all so written in the MS. and may have special significance; *enexillé* (11740) looks like a simple error of the scribe who had begun *en-* and forgotten to expunctuate it.

A. T. BAKER.

SHEFFIELD.

*La Folie Tristan de Berne*. Publiée avec commentaire par ERNEST HOEPFFNER. Paris. Les Belles Lettres. 1934. 155 pp. 15 francs.

M. Hoepffner underrates his contribution when he says (p. 32) that the chief merit of this book is to make the text accessible. His edition of the *Folie* has a considerable intrinsic value. He wisely aims at reproducing the text 'dans la forme transmise', and at justifying wherever possible the readings of the manuscript (notably in lines 278, 305, 375, 426, 434, 455, 459-60, 476). He might perhaps have gone even further in this direction. Thus, in line 328 (*Biën s'an porra apercevoir*) he replaces *s'an* by *l'an* because he sees no sense in the former. He asks: 'qui doit s'apercevoir? et de quoi?' The probable answer to the first question is 'Tristan', and to the second 'Brangien's prompt action'. Unlike the previous editors of the text, M. Hoepffner condemns lines 354-5 (*Icel Deus me mete en corage Qui me giet d'icest folage*). Yet it is not impossible to explain the original reading by the equation *qui* = 'qu'il', 'il' = *corage*. Some of M. Hoepffner's quarrels with the scribe are confined to the Notes; here again we occasionally feel tempted to take the side of the scribe. To give but one example, is it not natural for the poet to make Tristan recall the sun-ray that he saw in the hut (l. 201: *Parmi la loje vi un rai*)? And is it quite fair to object to this on the ground that 'c'est le roi et non pas Tristan qui doit voir le rayon'? But all these and the like are minor points of interpretation. The text as a whole is a distinct improvement on the earlier editions, and M. Hoepffner's commentary is an excellent guide; it contains valuable notes on every aspect and on practically every line of the text, and provides answers to many queries. The Introduction is much less illuminating. Here M. Hoepffner deals with the origins of the Berne *Folie* and rejects the view previously expressed by Lutoslawski, M. Bédier, and himself, that the Berne and the Oxford versions of the *Folie* go back to a common source. He thinks that the Oxford *Folie* is a courtly adaptation of the Berne poem and that Bérout is the immediate source of the latter. This, however, is a mere hypothesis, and M. Hoepffner is forced to repeat what M. Bédier said thirty years ago, namely that the problem is perhaps insoluble. Nor is there any certainty with regard to the dialect: it does not help much to say that 'la langue du poète prend un caractère moins nettement normand que celle de Bérout' or that it must be placed 'aux confins de la Normandie et de l'Isle de France'. As

to the date of the poem, M Hoepffner admits, rather pessimistically, that 'l'état linguistique du texte permet de l'attribuer tout aussi bien au milieu qu'à la fin du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, ou encore au début du XIII<sup>e</sup>'

EUGÈNE VINAVER.

MANCHESTER.

*Rabelais · The Five Books and Minor Writings, together with letters and documents illustrating his life* Translated, with introduction and notes, by W. F. SMITH 2nd ed Vol. 1: *Gargantua*. Cambridge. University Press. 1934. clxxiv + 284 pp. 15s.

La traduction du roman de Rabelais en une langue étrangère est une entreprise hérissée de difficultés qui pourrait faire reculer d'effroi l'érudit le plus familier avec la langue et les mœurs du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle, qu'on pense à la science encyclopédique de l'auteur, et qu'on imagine le travail que demande, par exemple, l'identification des deux cents noms de plantes cités dans le roman, ou des deux-cent dix-sept jeux de Gargantua. Nul ne connaissait mieux que W. F. Smith les dangers d'une telle tâche, et cependant il y a consacré la plus grande partie de sa vie.<sup>1</sup> Il est vrai que l'anglais peut se vanter de posséder dans la traduction d'Urquhart et Le Motteux un ouvrage remarquable, notre auteur, comme il le reconnaît lui-même, s'est souvent inspiré du travail de ses prédécesseurs; mais Urquhart n'a jamais songé à la précision scientifique, il n'est pas rare qu'il *out-Rabelais* Rabelais lui-même; quant à Le Motteux, il prend avec son modèle encore plus de libertés, et des libertés plus déplaisantes. La traduction de W. F. Smith au contraire, toute vigoureuse et pleine de verve qu'elle est, est scientifique, elle est d'une exactitude, d'une précision et souvent d'un bonheur étonnants. C'est un tour de force, mais un tour de force qui suppose un labeur extraordinaire.

La seule remarque qu'on puisse faire à ce point de vue porte sur la réserve inattendue que montre parfois W. F. Smith. Quand on se donne de propos délibéré la tâche de traduire Rabelais, on doit se résigner à l'avance aux grossièretés et aux obscénités, Smith parfois ne recule pas devant les crudités les plus malsonnantes, ailleurs il gaze ou il adoucit, ailleurs encore il a recours à de pudiques points de suspension, sans qu'on sache jamais pourquoi il est plus hardi ici que là. On ne peut s'empêcher de se demander comment un homme a pu, sans y être forcé, consacrer tant d'années de travail à un ouvrage 'from which one's feelings and pen recoiled'.<sup>2</sup> C'est que, comme l'a remarqué La Bruyère, Rabelais à la fois *est le charme de la canaille, et peut être le mets des plus délicats*. Des traducteurs comme Urquhart et Le Motteux plairont surtout à la première catégorie de lecteurs; W. F. Smith ne s'adresse qu'aux délicats.

Il fait aussi cependant appel aux savants; son érudition est admirable par sa variété, sa sûreté et sa précision. A elle seule, l'*Introduction* forme une étude approfondie de la vie, des œuvres et du génie si singulier de

<sup>1</sup> La première édition a paru en 1893, la seconde, dont le premier volume, imprimé après la mort de l'auteur, vient de paraître, corrige et, sur beaucoup de points, complète la première.

<sup>2</sup> *Introduction*, p. xiv.

Rabelais; quant aux notes, très nombreuses, sans l'être trop, et très nourries elles représentent un trésor de science. Pour cette seconde édition, l'auteur a naturellement mis à profit l'édition critique de M. Abel Lefranc<sup>1</sup>; mais ses notes ne sont jamais une traduction; toujours personnelles, elles contredisent parfois heureusement les observations de l'érudit français, et sur bien des points les complètent et les corrigent.

Cette traduction est un travail monumental qui fait le plus grand honneur à l'érudition anglaise.

F. J. TANQUEREY.

LONDON

*François Rabelais*. Par JEAN PLATTARD. Paris Boivin. 1932. 342 pp. 36 francs

Immense additions have been made during the last thirty years to our knowledge of Rabelais, of his family and education, the conditions in which he wrote, and the text of his book. Of this research the larger portion has no doubt been due to the activities of the *Société des Études rabelaisiennes*, of which M. Plattard is secretary, though the names of Mr Tilley and the late W. F. Smith remind us that England may claim credit for an honourable share. The present volume, which is only one of several important works which M. Plattard has devoted to Rabelais, is a conspectus and *mise au point* of all that was known on the subject. By avoiding the *minutiae* of technical discussion and controversy, and following the main thread of Rabelais's life and work, M. Plattard has written a book for the general public; the critical footnotes are, however, suitable to guide even advanced students who may wish to investigate the various problems.

A synthetic treatment of the subject is virtually imposed upon the author of a general work on Rabelais. The successive volumes of his book are best studied, not as a single whole, but as each was written and published. Rabelais himself had such an appetite for life, he believed in it and laughed at it so continuously that one would misinterpret him if one separated his incursions into literature from his personal problems and adventures. He was in touch with almost everything that was going on, and by following his peregrinations through France and Italy the reader is familiarised with a large part of Renaissance civilisation. In the course of these wanderings, with M. Plattard as guide, many interesting byways are opened up and helpful advice is given for their exploration.

With regard to the leading problems, the author pronounces distinctly and with authority. Thus on the question of Rabelais's attitude to the Reformation at the time of *Pantagruel*, he believes that, while by no means anxious to court martyrdom, Rabelais was in general sympathy with the 'Evangelical' group—a view contrary to that of M. Lefranc,

<sup>1</sup> *Œuvres de F. Rabelais*, Édition critique publiée par Abel Le Franc, Paris (1<sup>er</sup> volume), 1913.

who regards him as a rationalist. The question of the authenticity of the *Cinquième Livre*—perhaps the most difficult of all Rabelaisian problems—is treated at some length. It has been held in certain quarters that the original draft or ‘archetype’ (from which derive both *L’Isle Sonante* of 1562 and the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale) was definitely the work of Rabelais. M. Plattard takes up a sceptical attitude towards this hypothesis, and points out that neither a study of the sources, nor a comparison of the texts, nor a philological examination yields any decisive result. In adopting what is the usual view of the fifth book, he relies frankly on the impression conveyed by the tone and spirit of its content. His personal conclusion, which hardly differs in essentials from Mr Arthur Tilley’s, is that the *Cinquième Livre* contains passages from Rabelais’s pen which have been arranged, filled out and considerably added to by an unknown Huguenot writer.

M. Plattard’s book is attractively illustrated and possesses an index of proper names, but no bibliography. It will be welcomed by English students in view of the recent revival of interest in Rabelaisian studies in this country and the issue of a second edition of the late W. F. Smith’s translation, which has been undertaken by the Cambridge University Press.

A. LYTTON SELLS.

DURHAM.

*Les premières lettres de Guez de Balzac*, 1618–27. Édition critique, précédée d’une Introduction par H. BIBAS et K.-T. BUTLER. Paris: Droz (Société des Textes Français Modernes) 1934. 2 vols. xxxix + 298 pp.; 190 pp. 40 et 20 francs.

Ces lettres ont été un événement. Elles ont révélé à la France le prix et l’art d’une prose juste, articulée, cadencée, le style du grand siècle date d’elles, et ceux qui ne les jalousaient pas les ont portées aux nues. Cependant, elles n’ont plus trouvé d’éditeur depuis 1665. C’est donc une œuvre à peu près inconnue, et une œuvre importante, que nous rendent aujourd’hui Miss Bibas et Miss Butler.

Leur édition est excellente de soin et de science. C’est à mon sens un malheur que sur les deux problèmes critiques que posait leur texte, elles aient dû se rallier, si je comprends bien, à des solutions qu’elles auraient voulues différentes et qui semblent en effet contestables. On se réjouit en même temps de constater une fois de plus l’extrême diversité des problèmes que soulève le travail d’édition.

Les lettres se présentent en quatre séries distinctes. Au tome I, les 61 lettres de la première édition (1624), et les 3 lettres nouvelles de la seconde (1625). Au tome II, les 30 lettres nouvelles de la ‘sixième Édition, revue, corrigée, et augmentée de la mortuë’ (1627), et 7 lettres de la même période 1618–27, mais d’une autre provenance. De ces quatre séries, une seule, la dernière, donne les lettres par ordre de dates; les trois autres sont dans le plus parfait désordre, et les éditrices ont dû dresser deux tables chronô-

logiques, l'une pour le tome I, l'autre pour les tomes I et II. L'édition, telle quelle, il faut le dire, est un pêle-mêle.<sup>1</sup>

La solution paraissait s'imposer. c'était de nous donner l'édition chronologique que les éditrices avaient, ce semble, établie, ou tout au moins proposée, puisqu'elles nous disent (I, xxxiv) en avoir fait le sacrifice à regret. Le lecteur, sauf pour des raisons de métier, exceptionnelles et rares, n'aura pas besoin de se remettre devant les états anciens et successifs du texte.<sup>2</sup> Il voudra lire ces lettres dans l'ordre où elles ont été écrites (la table chronologique générale du tome II, p. 175, leur en fournira le moyen), la plupart ne *pourront* pas les lire autrement, à moins de faire violence à toutes leurs habitudes d'esprit. C'est ainsi que je les ai lues. C'est faisable, mais ce n'est pas commode.

Évidemment, la Société des Textes Français Modernes a voulu nous rendre l'œuvre qui a fait sensation au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Elle a aussi reculé devant l'énormité, la monstruosité, l'hérésie d'une édition factice, j'entends qui n'a jamais existé du vivant de Balzac (ni depuis sa mort). Sa décision se défend par tous les canons de l'orthodoxie.

Pour moi, j'aurais passé outre, résolument. Ce qui a intéressé les contemporains, ce qui nous intéresse, c'est le texte de Balzac, ce n'est pas son désordre. Encore n'est-ce même pas le sien; c'est celui de Boisrobert, qui a procuré la première édition, dans des conditions obscures, et qui a vraisemblablement déterminé par là toutes les autres.<sup>3</sup> Mais quand Balzac lui-même aurait ignoré le prix de la chronologie, devrions-nous perpétuer son erreur? Pourquoi les premières éditions nous lieraient-elles à tout jamais? Qu'a de sacré leur désordre, qui nous interdise d'y toucher? Nous ne sommes plus dans les conditions des contemporains. Nous avons d'autres besoins, d'autres habitudes. Ils se retrouvaient peut-être dans le dédale où, plus loin des choses, nous nous perdons. Les premiers éditeurs n'ont même pas classé les lettres systématiquement par correspondants; sauf pour les lettres XLIV ss., qui sont libertines, on n'aperçoit aucune raison, ni de logique, ni de politique, ni d'art, qui justifie ou explique leur procédé. On peut dire que leurs éditions infligent le plus cruel des démentis à l'ordre que Balzac s'évertuait à créer dans sa pensée et dans son style. Sa physionomie intellectuelle et morale, la suite de sa vie et des faits se dispersent et se brisent à chaque instant dans ce perpétuel zigzag. Enfin, s'il y a une vérité acquise, c'est que des lettres n'ont de sens que dans leur ordre chronologique. Nous ne *pouvons*, physiquement, mentalement, lire des lettres que dans l'ordre chronologique. Et ce sont des lettres que nous avons là, non des traités de morale ou de politique. Il est vrai qu'elles n'ont pas toujours une date

<sup>1</sup> De même, les notices biographiques sur les correspondants de Balzac sont réparties entre les deux tomes. L'ouvrage a encore une introduction historique et bibliographique (tome I), un avant-propos (tome II), un erratum du tome I (au tome II, p. 4), un Index des noms propres. Le tout de main de maître.

<sup>2</sup> L'édition chronologique donnerait naturellement les tables des matières des éditions anciennes.

<sup>3</sup> La préface de La Motte Aigron arriva trop tard pour que Boisrobert la mit au commencement de l'ouvrage, et il la mit à la fin. Nous la retrouvons naturellement à la même place dans l'édition nouvelle, p. 237. C'est de la superstition.



sûre, mais l'incertitude n'en est pas telle, surtout après la critique serrée et heureuse des éditrices, qu'elle fit difficulté

En somme, l'établissement d'une édition moderne des lettres de Balzac révèle un conflit curieux entre les besoins et habitudes des deux siècles, et même entre deux exigences actuelles de l'esprit historique. L'édition orthodoxe et l'édition hérétique disposent une matière exactement la même sur deux plans exactement opposés. A cela, point de remède, si ce n'est par des jeux d'écriture compliqués. Il faut choisir. Chacun choisira selon ses tendances.

Le texte de base est pris de l'édition princeps, conformément, nous disent les éditrices (I, xxxiv), à la tradition de la Société des Textes Français Modernes. C'est une tradition nouvelle, je crois me souvenir qu'il y a quelques années, la Société tenait pour le dernier texte revu par l'auteur. J'approuve fort ce changement, si changement il y a, car j'ai préconisé dans mon volume de *Techniques* la reproduction de la princeps, à condition toutefois qu'aucune raison particulière ne s'y opposât. Je regretterais que la Société en fit une règle. Il n'y a pas de règle en la matière; chaque texte a ses exigences, chaque problème sa solution; le choix du texte de base est toujours une question d'espèce. Or, ici, la première édition est évidemment concurrencée par la sixième,<sup>1</sup> que les éditrices nous donnent (I, xxxiv) pour 'la première qui ait pu bénéficier de la surveillance de Balzac, la première aussi qu'il ait avouée, par la bouche de Silhon [cf. II, 9], la première qui témoigne de quelque soin'. Autant dire qu'elle est la vraie première. Il subsiste cependant une difficulté. La sixième édition apporte des passages nouveaux, longs et nombreux, que les éditrices estiment (II, 2) 'restitués plutôt qu'ajoutés', mais dont elles n'ont pas pu découvrir l'origine sûre, tout en ne doutant pas de leur authenticité.<sup>2</sup> Il paraît en effet impossible de les suspecter, puis qu'ils figurent dans toutes les éditions à partir de la sixième et que Balzac ne les a pas dénoncés. Dans ces conditions, et en raison du peu d'autorité de la princeps, il semble que le texte de 1627 devait avoir la préférence. La Société pouvait, à mon sens, concéder ce point sans contredire l'esprit de sa doctrine, ni même sa lettre, si on ne donne pas au mot princeps une acception purement numérique. Le texte de 1624 n'a peut-être pour lui qu'une règle toute formelle et mécanique, inconciliable avec la complexité des cas et des problèmes.

Le soin et le travail des éditrices sont exemplaires. L'annotation, très poussée, vient des meilleures sources, françaises et italiennes, contemporaines et modernes. Elle ne présente pour ainsi dire pas de lacune et se tient presque toujours dans une mesure parfaite. Il manque seulement un certain nombre de millésimes dans les notes, mais la lecture chronologique atténue sensiblement ce petit défaut.

La reproduction pieuse de la princeps n'a pas permis de donner les dates entre crochets au haut des lettres. C'était leur place; il est irritant d'aller les chercher sous la signature, quand les éditrices n'ont pas à les discuter dans la note initiale. Elles les discutent très bien. Quelques-unes

<sup>1</sup> Les 4<sup>e</sup> et 5<sup>e</sup> n'ont pas été retrouvées, si elles ont existé.

<sup>2</sup> Voir l'importante discussion des pp. I, xxix-xxxii et II, 12.

inspirent un doute encore plus ferme que celui qu'elles expriment. Pour la lettre XI (I, 46), la date du [12 sept.] 1623 ne s'accorde assurément pas avec les dates de la condamnation par contumace (19 août) et de l'arrestation de Théophile (17 ou 19 septembre, selon les pp. 48 et 38), mais non plus avec ce que Balzac dit (p. 50, ll. 19-20) de son silence de trois ans, alors que la lettre X est datée du 4 août; ni avec les premières lignes de la XII<sup>e</sup>. À la lettre XIX, pp. 89-90, les mots 'la Comete de dernièrement', c'est à dire de novembre 1618, ne vont pas bien avec la date, d'ailleurs conjecturale, du 2 juillet 1620.—Lettre XXII (I, 102), le mot 'approcher' (l. 7) et les dates fournies aux notes 1 et 2 (qui auraient dû être fondues en une seule et mises en ordre) renforcent encore les objections à la date du 16 septembre 1622.—Au reste, les problèmes de datation se présentent chez Balzac sous une forme un peu spéciale, et les moyens ordinaires ne suffisent pas à les résoudre, ils pourraient même égarer. Balzac mettait tant de temps à écrire ses lettres et il les a si probablement remises au point pour l'impression qu'elles répondent parfois à plusieurs dates. Les éditrices ont eu clairement conscience de ces conditions et se sont abstenues sagement de poursuivre la précision absolue.

Je m'en tiens à l'examen critique de cette édition critique. Sur la diversité d'aspects, assez inattendue, que ces lettres révèlent chez Balzac, Miss Bibas et Miss Butler ont (I, 7-8) une page délicate, qui suffira à diriger la lecture. Elles annoncent une biographie détaillée de Balzac; nul, assurément, n'est outillé comme elles pour l'écrire.

G. RUDLER.

OXFORD.

*La Mothe Le Vayer: Sa Vie et son Œuvre.* Par FLORENCE L. WICKELGREN.  
Paris: Droz. 1934. 307 pp. 40 francs.

Writers on the seventeenth century have always been hampered, even though they may not have realised it, by the absence of any adequate work on La Mothe Le Vayer. Dr Wickelgren's thesis has, on the whole, been soundly planned. In eight long chapters she examines Le Vayer's life and friends; the sources of his ideas, the *Dialogues d'Orasius Tubero*; the political and historical writings; the *Considérations sur l'Éloquence française*; the religious philosophy; the *Petits Traités*; while in the last chapter an attempt is made to place Le Vayer in his true position in relation to Montaigne, Charron and Pascal, and to trace his influence on later seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century writers.

It may be said at once that Miss Wickelgren has not shirked the difficulties presented by her subject—which are immense. She has carefully considered the works in Montaigne's library, part of which was inherited by Le Vayer and from which he may therefore have drawn. Her analysis of the use made both by Montaigne and Le Vayer of Seneca and Sextus Empiricus seems particularly valuable. She has shown conclusively that Le Vayer drew directly from the Ancients and that his great master was Sextus Empiricus (one wonders, only, whether he may not have owed

more to Pomponazzi than is here suggested). Furthermore, she shows that Le Vayer by no means confined himself to Sceptical philosophy; he was also in touch with the current of Neo-Stoicism; and while the principal substance of his thought was indeed drawn from the Pyrrhonists, he was able to reinforce it on the moral side with Stoic discipline and so reach a point where the Sceptical 'metriopatheia' is hardly distinguishable from the Stoic 'apathy'. Miss Wickelgren's analysis of the dialogues is well conducted; and the same may be said of her study of *La Vertu des Payens*, in this chapter she also explains the circumstances which gave rise to the work and the part it played in the struggle between Jansenism and its adversaries.

It was perhaps inevitable that a work on so difficult a subject should not be uniformly successful. The biographical section, for instance, is less lively than one could wish. It was surely a mistake to separate the study of Le Vayer's friends from the outline of his life; this would have gained in vividness if Miss Wickelgren had attempted to place Le Vayer in his setting by reconstructing, for example, the atmosphere of his conversations in the circle at Gentilly, or of his later home life in the city. The discussion of the works, which follows on this opening chapter, is generally adequate; but the *Prose chagrine* is here almost lost among the *Petits Traités*, and the space devoted to it hardly conveys to a reader unfamiliar with the book an idea of the interest and the strange flavour of this remarkable confession. Miss Wickelgren has not apparently had access to Ernest Tisserand's essay on Le Vayer, which appeared in 1922, nor does she seem familiar with M. É. Magne's *Une Amie inconnue de Molière* (1922). These would have at least suggested a fuller treatment of Le Vayer's relations with Molière than here appears. There is more to be said about *Les Femmes Savantes* and about Molière's views on medical science; while the question of the *Misanthrope* has been wholly ignored. These are matters of no small importance, since they concern one of the greatest writers of Europe. In the purely philosophical sphere Miss Wickelgren appears to have made a careful examination of Le Vayer's various sources, as far as her treatment of the ancient Sceptics is concerned, she might, however, have availed herself with advantage of V. Brochard's classic work on the subject. It is a pity, also, that M. Henri Busson's *Pensée religieuse française de Charron à Pascal* had not appeared in time for her to make use of it.

It should be added that the author has been very badly served by the printer and that the list of Errata is very far from being complete. One cannot, on the other hand, fail to recognise the real merits of the work. Miss Wickelgren has unravelled many strands which were confused, and assembled a vast amount of pertinent observation.

A. LYTTON SELLS.

*L'Esthétique de Schelling et l'Allemagne de Madame de Stael.* By JEAN GIBELIN. Paris Champion. 1934. xvii + 94 pp. 45 francs.

Cette étude est la thèse complémentaire d'une thèse de doctorat sur *l'Esthétique de Schelling d'après la Philosophie de l'Art* (Paris, Vrin, 1933).

M. Gibelin rappelle d'abord ce que nous pouvons savoir, historiquement, de l'initiation de Mme de Stael aux doctrines de Schelling. Les traités abstrus des philosophes allemands la rebutaient, bien qu'elle en sentît l'importance et l'intérêt. Pour Schelling la difficulté se compliquait de ce fait que sa *Philosophie de l'Art* était inédite, et qu'on n'en connaissait que le cours qu'il venait de faire à Iéna, en 1802-3. A Weimar Mme de Stael trouva, comme informateur, Crabb Robinson, qui avait suivi ce cours, mais qui se plaignait lui-même de l'obscurité de Schelling. Aux témoignages que M. Gibelin cite, sur cette première période d'information, il faudrait ajouter un passage du *Journal intime* de Benjamin Constant et quelques lignes intéressantes de Bottiger, dans ses *Memorabillen*. M. Gibelin aurait trouvé ces textes, et peut-être d'autres indications utiles, dans une étude sur *Schiller et le romantisme français* (tome I, pp. 325, 440), qu'il ne mentionne pas dans sa bibliographie. A Berlin, enfin, Mme de Stael rencontra Schlegel, et se l'attacha: informateur précieux, puisqu'il avait vécu dans l'intimité intellectuelle de Schelling, mais informateur sujet à caution, puisqu'il était loin d'approuver toutes ses idées, et devait même, plus tard, le juger sans indulgence, en tant que philosophe. Quant à Schelling, Mme de Stael ne le rencontra que lors de son second voyage: elle eut avec lui, à Munich, en décembre 1807, quelques entretiens sur le détail desquels nous ne savons rien de précis. En somme M. Gibelin ne cite aucun document qui permette d'affirmer que Mme de Stael ait fait une étude approfondie et directe des œuvres de Schelling.

Ce qu'elle dit de sa philosophie, dans le livre *De l'Allemagne*, confirmerait plutôt ce doute. Les termes ('excellent littérateur') dont elle se sert pour désigner Schelling, et dans lesquels M. Gibelin voit 'un compliment bref mais sincère', sont d'une banalité qui répond mal à l'originalité du transcendantalisme schellingien. Elle est loin de lui faire dans son livre une place comparable à celle qu'elle réserve à Kant, ou même à Jacobi: elle ne lui consacre que quelques pages d'un chapitre (partie III, chap. 7). Cette philosophie de la nature, que Cuvier, à Paris, dès 1801, s'appliquait à 'déchiffrer' (cf. la *Lettre* de Charles de Villers à Cuvier, Metz, 1802), Mme de Stael n'en a manifestement qu'une connaissance sommaire. Elle la réduit, comme elle fait pour d'autres philosophes, à des formules simplistes, schématiques, presque caricaturales ('Schelling tente d'élever la matière jusqu'à l'âme'). Sans doute l'idéalisme de Schelling répondait à ses préférences pour les doctrines spiritualistes, à son antipathie pour le sensualisme anglo-français. Mais M. Gibelin n'a pas de peine à montrer que cet idéalisme absolu, transcendantal, heurtait les sentiments de Mme de Stael: elle est attachée au subjectivisme rousseauiste et kantien; elle croit à l'intuition sentimentale, non à l'intuition intellectuelle, à un dieu personnel, non à un dieu abstrait identifié à l'absolu, à l'immortalité individuelle, non à l'immortalité transcendante; elle ne veut pas perdre le

contact avec le monde des phénomènes, auquel Schelling dénie toute réalité. C'est à propos de Schelling qu'elle ironise sur ces systèmes allemands 'si difficiles à comprendre', qui 'prétent, quelque sérieux qu'on soit, à la plaisanterie, car il y a toujours des méprises dans les ténèbres'. Et tout cela ne prouve encore pas qu'elle ait vraiment lu Schelling.

Passant à l'esthétique, M. Gibelin compare les idées de Schelling et de Mme de Stael sur le génie, la fantaisie, le lyrisme, l'épopée, le théâtre, la critique littéraire et les beaux-arts. Ici tant de vues sont communes, ou partiellement communes, à Schelling et à Schlegel, que son étude s'étend insensiblement de la relation Stael-Schelling à la relation Stael-Schlegel, avec le double inconvénient que la relation Stael-Schelling devient moins distincte, sans que la relation Stael-Schlegel puisse être traitée aussi complètement qu'elle devrait. Saisissons-nous là, du moins, des preuves d'une connaissance plus directe et d'une influence?

En réalité, il ressort de l'exposé même de M. Gibelin que les traces d'une filiation directe et précise de Schelling à Mme de Stael se réduisent à bien peu de chose. Certains rapprochements qu'il établit sont bien douteux. Si Mme de Stael parle de 'l'âme de la nature', est-ce parce qu'elle se souvient du titre de Schelling *Von der Weltseele*? (p. 32). Quand elle dit que la métaphysique est 'la science de l'immuable', fait-elle allusion à la philosophie de l'identité? l'expression ne convient-elle pas, dans sa pensée, à toute métaphysique? (p. 49). Ou bien il s'agit de simples formules, qui peuvent venir de Schelling sans que Mme de Stael les ait prises chez lui, puisque, comme le constate M. Gibelin, ces analogies verbales cachent souvent de profonds malentendus. Telles sont certaines phrases de Mme de Stael, sur le beau, où l'on pourrait voir une influence de la doctrine platonicienne et schellingienne de la réminiscence: mais M. Gibelin reconnaît (p. 25) que Schlegel usait de formules analogues, et que d'ailleurs ni Schlegel ni Mme de Stael n'admettent les théories de Schelling, déduites de cette conception initiale, sur la valeur positive et absolue du symbole, et sur la signification philosophique de la mythologie. Ailleurs, quand Mme de Stael parle de l'universalité du génie, M. Gibelin suspecte d'abord une réminiscence de Schelling, mais il constate bientôt que Mme de Stael se fait de cette universalité une idée 'contraire' à celle du philosophe allemand (p. 46). L'emprunt le plus net que Mme de Stael fasse à Schelling est peut-être cette formule: 'le monde ressemble plus à un poème qu'à une machine'. Mais ce texte était cité par Schlegel dans ses conférences de Berlin, et d'ailleurs, comme le remarque M. Gibelin (p. 35), Mme de Stael est trop attachée à la réalité du monde sensible, et à l'expérience, pour que la mention de cette formule, dont l'idéalisme lui plaît, signifie son adhésion à la philosophie transcendante. Le plus souvent les rapprochements qu'on peut établir entre elle et Schelling portent sur des idées qui sont aussi celles de Schlegel. La conception mystique de génie leur est commune. au reste, ici encore, l'analogie des mots cache un désaccord des pensées, car Mme de Stael identifie le génie à l'enthousiasme, Schelling à la fantaisie. L'opposition que Schelling établit entre les littératures antiques, où règne le destin, et les littératures modernes, où règne la Providence, était aussi dans le *Cours* de Schlegel: M. Gibelin le

reconnaît (p. 64, note) mais il attribue à une influence de Schelling le rapport que Mme de Stael constate d'une part entre la sculpture et la littérature antique, d'autre part entre la peinture et la littérature moderne or Schlegel dit exactement la même chose dans son *Cours de littérature dramatique* (II, 330). Ce qui porterait à croire que c'est par Schlegel que Mme de Stael a connu Schelling, ce sont tous les passages où elle se rallie, contre Schelling, aux vues de Schlegel. Elle a, comme Schlegel, une conception kantienne de la tragédie, et voit en elle le triomphe de la volonté libre, tandis que pour Schelling l'effet de l'art doit être d'annihiler l'individuation. La critique littéraire, pour elle comme pour Schlegel, doit être historique et inductive, et non philosophique et a priori, comme la conçoit Schelling. En architecture Schelling est antiquisant. Schlegel, après avoir partagé ses vues, évolua vers l'art médiéval, dont Mme de Stael prend la défense, dans *l'Allemagne*.

Tel est le bilan de cette enquête. Peut-on parler d'une influence de Schelling sur Mme de Stael? Les déclarations de M. Gibelin, sur ce point, ne concordent pas toujours p. 63 'on pourrait encore multiplier ces rapprochements. . .' (pourquoi ne pas les multiplier?), p. 65 'nous avons vu combien d'idées, de formules même, Mme de Stael avait empruntées à Schelling'. Mais p. 88 'pour Schelling, Mme de Stael dut y renoncer: ce bloc de granit, suivant l'expression de Caroline, n'offrait rien d'assimilable'. Finalement M. Gibelin estime que le livre *De l'Allemagne* est 'nettement antischellingien' (p. 87) il va même jusqu'à y voir (p. 71) un 'manifeste' contre l'idéalisme transcendantal, ce qui est exagérer démesurément l'importance que Mme de Stael attribue à cette doctrine. Au reste un 'manifeste' antischellingien supposerait une étude approfondie de Schelling. Est-ce le cas? Peut-on même affirmer que Mme de Stael ait lu Schelling? Tantôt M. Gibelin le croit (p. 64. 'Mme de Stael avait profité de la lecture de Schelling'), tantôt il use de formules plus prudentes (p. 52: 'Certaines analogies, certaines allusions nous font voir qu'ici encore Mme de Stael n'a pas ignoré la doctrine de Schelling'). En fait, le doute s'impose. Dans d'autres parties du livre *De l'Allemagne*, par exemple dans les chapitres que Mme de Stael consacre aux tragédies de Schiller, les jugements qu'elle porte, comparés à ceux de Schlegel, manifestent nettement l'indépendance de son goût, et sont assez précis pour qu'on puisse affirmer qu'elle jugeait sur les textes. Rien de semblable pour Schelling. L'exposé de la philosophie transcendantale manque à tel point de précision qu'il peut parfaitement avoir été fait sur des matériaux de seconde main. Quant aux doctrines esthétiques de Schelling, Mme de Stael n'en a rien retenu qu'elle n'ait pu trouver dans Schlegel ou tenir de lui: ainsi s'explique peut-être qu'elle ait pu retenir, à l'occasion, certaines formules, sans se soucier d'adopter, ou même de s'assimiler, le système philosophique auquel elles se rattachaient.

Sur cette base étroite et peu sûre, renforcée, il est vrai, par une comparaison des jugements que Mme de Stael et Schelling ont portés sur le *Faust* de Goethe, M. Gibelin a entrepris, dans la dernière partie de sa thèse, la discussion de quelques questions générales concernant le livre *De l'Allemagne*: Mme de Stael est-elle classique ou

romantique? est-elle un esprit germanique, ou un esprit européen, ou un esprit français? Ces questions dépassent de beaucoup le sujet traité. Un tel débat ne pourrait aboutir à des conclusions substantielles que s'il procédait d'une étude générale des sources de Mme de Stael, de sa méthode de documentation, et particulièrement du rôle de Schlegel, en tant qu'informateur. Encore faudrait-il, pour une enquête de ce genre, que nous fussions plus documentés que nous ne sommes actuellement. Qui nous donnera enfin une édition historique et critique du livre *De l'Allemagne*, en utilisant les notes, extraits, traductions, résumés, dont Mme de Stael a dû se servir—si toutefois ces matériaux existent encore dans les archives de Coppet?

E. EGGLI.

LIVERPOOL.

*Bibliographie critique de l'Hellénisme en France de 1843 à 1870* Par HENRI PEYRE. New Haven Yale University Press; London H Milford. 1932. 230 pp. 15s. 6d

To write the history of Hellenism in nineteenth-century France, that is the history not merely of Greek studies, but of all that has been associated with the memory and the legacy of ancient Greece, is one of those vast undertakings which will probably wait many years before finding an author. It will be obvious that, in this connexion, no period since the Renaissance possesses an interest as absorbing as the Romantic era and the age immediately succeeding it. Certain features of this Hellenic revival have already been outlined for us: we have had, in 1911, M. Canat's *Renaissance de la Grèce antique* (1820–50); in 1926, M. C. Clerc's *Génie du Paganisme*; in 1928, M. Desonay's *Rêve hellénique chez les poètes parnassiens*. A study of Hellenism during the Romantic era has been announced by M. Canat; and it has therefore remained for Professor Peyre to investigate that period when Romanticism, without being exactly abandoned, was changing into something cooler and more intellectual, the period of 'Le Parnasse', the age of Flaubert and Renan.

That the revival of Hellenism was, in large measure, a product of the Romantic movement, we are of course aware. M. Peyre rightly insists on its 'Romantic' origins. The French Romantics, though perhaps less than their English *confrères*, were deeply imbued with Greek and Latin culture. It is not of course altogether illusory to associate Greek culture with Classicism, the lesson of ancient art is a lesson of rationalism, of order, of the cult of form—in moderation; and these things seem to bring it nearer to the classical ideal. On the other hand, much of the beauty of ancient Greece which had been hidden from the age of reason was revealed to the fresher vision of the Romantics, and this was an essential; though not perhaps *the* essential, for one lesson of ancient culture remained unlearned. How few among the Romantics were found to reflect, with Wordsworth, that

the gods approve  
The depth, and not the tumult of the soul!

And indeed one is no more disposed than M. Peyre to say which of the two literary schools, the classical or the romantic, is nearer to the Greek spirit.

Although Hellenism must be rooted in a scholarly understanding of the language and civilisation of ancient Greece, the sense and implications of the word are much more wide. M. Peyre observes that 'le véritable hellénisme littéraire ou artistique s'accompagne presque toujours d'une préférence sentimentale accordée à la Grèce'. Sometimes it is connected with a desire to seek refuge in an ideal dream, or it springs from a reaction against modern beliefs and modern practices 'On prône presque toujours l'hellénisme contre quelque chose.' To adore ancient Greece was for many writers to protest against the commercialism of the mid-nineteenth century, or against a facile acceptance of the theory of progress. First and last, however, we are impressed by the 'sentimental' and 'imaginative' qualities of modern Hellenism. It cannot, on the one hand, be separated from erudition, but, on the other, it must spring from something deeper and more personal if it is to become a potent force in art. In this larger sense, ancient Athens has ceased to be the perquisite of history or literary criticism and become, as John Masefield says of Troy, 'a city in the soul'.

The present work is in some measure complementary to the great study on Louis Ménard which we have reviewed in these pages. It is far more than a bibliography. In an introduction of over 70 pages M. Peyre surveys the country he has been exploring, and gives a fascinating description of it; although, owing to the fact that certain literary features of the period are still imperfectly known, he does not pretend to do more than provide material for a fuller study. The critical bibliography which constitutes the bulk of this work (pp 83-215) contains 1143 entries. The editor has subjected to a careful scrutiny the whole literary output of the period; and how arduous his task has been may be judged from the fact that the *Journal de la Librairie* gives from 7000 to 12,000 volumes for each year between 1843 and 1870, and that M. Peyre rarely found more than 40 or 50 works, in any one year, relating to Greece.

M. Peyre believes that critics have over-estimated the place of Hellenism in *Le Parnasse contemporain*; the real bond of union between the poets contributing to it was not their Hellenism, but a kind of 'romantisme mitigé'. Nevertheless, considering such men as Leconte de Lisle, Banville, Ménard, Heredia and Louis Bouilhet, one must recognise that they renewed the Greek inspiration in French poetry because they were, in varying degrees, real scholars and had drawn from the work of recent French and German specialists.

The student of nineteenth-century Hellenism will find in M. Peyre's *Bibliographie* a reference book which will not only save him months of toil, but offer illuminating suggestions and clues to guide him through a little known country. M. Peyre has shown what an attractive and truly intelligent thing the art of bibliography can be, when it is informed by feeling and imagination.

A. LYTTON SELLS.



*La grammatica degl' Italiani.* By C. TRABALZA e E. ALLODOLI. Florence: Le Monnier. 1934. xi + 341 pp. 15 lire.

This grammar has been received with unusual favour by the general public in Italy, it has been greeted with various degrees of enthusiasm and competency by reviewers in almost every daily paper of that country, and philologists and grammarians also have been very sparing in criticising it. There is no doubt that it deserves the editorial success it is enjoying. In preparing this work Professor Ciro Trabalza, the well-known author of the history of Italian grammar, has had the assistance of Professor Allodoli, a critic and novelist, and of Professor Schiaffini who contributed some admirably concise paragraphs on phonology and word formation. What strikes the reader from the outset is the novelty of the plan and the freshness of the exemplification throughout this grammar. So far as was possible the authors have done away with rules, endeavouring on the contrary to describe and to explain, in short and lucidly written paragraphs, what is necessary to know about the different parts of the language and its use. The result is that learners (for a grammar must ultimately be destined to students even though for the present it enjoys the dubious distinction of being a best-seller) will feel that a living language is a truly living thing in continuous process of formation, and not a corpse to be calmly dissected and recomposed. The obsolete terminology borrowed from Latin and Greek grammars about cases and accidence is of course carefully eschewed. On the contrary, a number of facts are mentioned that old grammarians ignored, for this book is meant to describe the Italian language as it is spoken and written to-day and has been written since Dante's age, so that a large proportion of the examples is drawn from living authors, occasionally from distinguished journalists. Dante and Manzoni together provide almost the whole of the rest, and the choice of so many examples taken from Manzoni is significant, if one remembers that the two authors are natives of Umbria and Tuscany respectively. This grammar thus constitutes almost the first academic acknowledgment of the change that has become noticeable of late years in Italian language and style, and is a document, I should venture to say, in that long debated question concerning the nature of the Italian language that Dante was the first to moot and which has exercised Italians ever since. Madame Labande-Jeanroy has maintained that it was in a way a fictitious polemic.<sup>1</sup> About the past there may be two opinions; about the present we know, and this book shows, that there can only be one. Foscolo never tired of proclaiming that a literary language exists only in books, and that Italian in particular is spoken nowhere. To a certain extent this may have been true in his days and also much later, for Italy lacked a unifying political centre and a truly national life until the second half of the nineteenth century. And even political unity did not linguistically weld the people of Italy at once, so that in a certain sense all Italians, with the possible exception of those who were born in Tuscany, wrote a language that they seldom spoke and

<sup>1</sup> *La question de la langue en Italie*, Strasbourg, 1925, pp. 225 ff.

never spoke as their own. Possibly through the agency of the war and the constant shifts of the population that it has entailed, or as a result of earlier and later political developments, all this has been altered. Italians from the different regions have ceased to feel their language as being merely school-taught, and the influx of spoken idioms, Tuscan mainly but also from other dialects, has become irresistible, enormously enriching the vocabulary and considerably affecting the syntax. Here then there was the *occasione*, as Machiavelli would have called it, and the authors, by seizing it, have rendered a real service to all. The success of their work depends no doubt in part upon their acceptance of the views of Croce and Gentile on language, but it is also due to the instinctive consciousness that Italians have acquired of possessing and using a national language. Specialists may reasonably contend that such a grammar as the one conceived by the authors encroaches upon the boundaries of vocabulary and of style, they may point out that the method professed by the authors has not always been rigidly applied; they may single out some instances of confusion between spoken and written language in the historical section, but about the timeliness of the appearance of this book, and upon its careful and felicitous preparation, critics can have only one mind.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

*I libri commerciali dei Peruzzi.* Per cura di ARMANDO SAPORI. (Pubblicazioni della direzione degli *Studi medievali*, I) Milan: Treves. 1934. xlviii + 570 pp. 120 lire.

The object of this truly handsome publication would put it outside the scope of the *Modern Language Review*, for Professor Saponi has been repeatedly at pains to point out that it is intended as a source for economic history; and he even comments unfavourably upon earlier and partial editions of these and similar documents as having been due to the generally historical and linguistic interest they arouse. He does, however, admit that men of letters such as Monaci and Del Lungo firstly called attention, if for different purposes, to the importance of these papers. He provides a learned preface and a technical bibliography of great interest, besides a full description of each of the manuscripts; and there is no doubt that for the history of trade and of banking houses this work will acquire a pre-eminent significance; particularly as, should it meet with the favour it obviously deserves, the series will be continued with the publication of the ledgers of other Florentine business firms. But we note that this series is sponsored by the editors of the *Studi medievali*, and we find so much in this book that is of wider than a purely economic interest, that we make no apology for calling on it the attention of general historians and philologists. Anyone interested in the history of family names, in the Italian transcription of foreign names, in Florentine spelling, in the vocabulary of trade, in Italian morphology, will find here a wealth of invaluable information. Professor Saponi has provided no glossary.

but in the index of names and important matters he has included peculiar terms, grouping them together according to their meaning, so that many linguistic facts are already collected if not yet commented upon. It is important to bear in mind that these ledgers were kept by the principals and not by clerks of the firms, and that they have of course not been transcribed, the vagaries of spelling acquire therefore a particular significance (cp *luglo* and *lugho*, *chapella* and *capella*, *guadangno* and *guadangno* all on p. 14, the form *kalen settembre*, etc., is far more frequent than *kalendr*, p. 523; frequent is the first person plural *aven* for *avemo*; almost constant initial *z* before *s* followed by a consonant, *zstetto*, *zscritto*, *zschetto*, constant is also the duplication of initial consonants after enclitical prepositions and pronouns *a Nnuvola*, *che ssono*, etc.). Travelling about, these merchants learned foreign languages and could act as interpreters; thus Simone di Rinieri wrote (p. 523 ad a. 1378) 'Messere Gianni Aghud chapitaneggi gl' Inghilesi e i Brettoni, il conte Luccio chapitaneggi le vostre lancia tedesche'. Messere Gianni ène inghilese, il Chonte è tedesco queste due lingue si fanno male insieme; io sarò utile e buono mezzo tra loro due, e sono dimesticho e praticho choll' una lingua e choll' altra'. There are, of course, a good many references to England, particularly to the rate of exchange between English and Florentine money, some English place-names have been ably identified by the editor; it would be difficult to recognise York in the garb of Evervic, and yet (p. 58) we find that 'Giovanni Giuntini a Evervic in Inghilterra' lent money to 'ser Gualtiero fiamingho' and purchased a house from him; a statement that is borne out by an entry in the *Calendar of Close Rolls* (Edw. III, 366), where we learn that 'Walter Flemying son of Walter Flemying of York' granted to 'John Juntin . . . all his tenements, etc.' Similarly 'Belluogo Leroi' stands for Beauheu Abbey. This book is of large size, beautifully printed on thick paper and strongly bound, and its comparatively low price is conceivably due to the contribution that the Bank of Italy has most opportunely made towards the cost of publication.

C. FOLIGNO.

OXFORD.

*Carlos María Ocantos, Argentine novelist.* A Study of indigenous, French and Spanish elements in his work. By THEODORE ANDERSSON. Yale Romanic Studies, VIII. Yale and Oxford University Presses. 1934. xii + 136 pp. \$ 1.50.

Dario characterised Ocantos in the two-edged sentence: 'Carlos María Ocantos escribe novelas absolutamente españolas cuyo argumento se desarrolla en Buenos Aires.' The statement has, it would appear, the verbal authorisation of Sr Ocantos, who remarked to Don José Francés: 'Cuando inicié la novela galdosiana en mi tierra con mi *León Zaldívar*, le di orientación completamente española, sin perjuicio de ser regional y prescindiendo de la inclinación afrancesada...etc.' He has closed his career as a novelist by turning definitively to amateur painting on a Spanish estate, and has lived for forty years by choice and by his diplo-

matic profession beyond the frontiers of his own land. To the Spanish Academy he was elected on the ground of his *casticismo* and at the proposal of Galdós, Valera and Pereda; and it is to this body he serves as 'Argentina's foremost literary ambassador' (p. 28). Let us add that he lacks recognition in his own land, and is not mentioned in Max Daireaux's *Littérature hispano-américaine*, which, for all its inexactitudes, represents the opinion of Franco-American groups in Paris. Finally, Professor Coester (Madrid, 1929—Mr Andersson quotes only from the edition of 1924) remarks with some coolness that in the *Novelas argentinas* Ocantos 'ha querido merecer el nombre de Balzac argentino', but that critics think his long absence has caused his observations to lack exactitude. Mr Andersson is able to show with what industry and talent Ocantos has set about embalming the years 1880-1925 in twenty-seven volumes, twenty of which form the *Novelas argentinas*. He shows, as we may well believe, that there is an almost total want of gallicism after the novelist's first purge of his Argentine colloquial; and that the influence of Zola, Balzac and Flaubert reached Ocantos only as reflected by Galdós. The *Novelas argentinas* are, in fact, Argentine counterparts to the Galdosian *Novelas españolas contemporáneas* (including those *de la primera época*), which they resemble in every way in their handling of Spanish, in their cross-references, in their insistence on social theses (doubtless not less sincerely felt for being somewhat banal), in their optimistic liberalism, in their (if I may say so) anonymity and atonymity which so often make us think of types and milieus rather than of specific places and real men and women. All the Galdosian ingredients are there, mixed with more than Galdosian carefulness. 'into each novel go similar elements: a simple plot, a social problem, a goodly amount of local colour, a little history, some satire and moralizing, all of which is carefully calculated and nicely proportioned.' Ocantos definitely declines to write the *idioma nacional argentino* of Lucien Abeille, and describes even the most intimately Argentine scenes with the help of no more than *tal cual palabreja local*.

Mr Andersson writes a concluding chapter which leaves open the question of Ocantos' status, though leaving no doubt that he himself is on the side of the angels. I doubt if we need to accept his alternatives *casticismo* or *afrancesamiento* in the Spanish American novel. Without subscribing to Blanco-Fombona's *criollismo* either, one may still perceive in Blanco-Fombona's novels an element of freshness, urgency and vigour which seems wanting in the pale correctness of Ocantos. The latter's sentence-structure has not even kept pace with Spanish stylistic changes. The Venezuelan's figures, *caraqueños* and provincials, coruscate with the St Elmo's fire of his hatred and contempt, and the style is racy and aquiver with words that flash and stab and do not fear to misdeemean themselves on occasion. Contrast the immortal telegram sent by General Aquiles Chicharra in *El hombre de oro*—every word a sarcasm of the author's—with the tepid effort of Don Claro Aldúnez cited on p. 43! Is it possible to represent a *gaucho malo* by means of academic Spanish with only *tal cual palabreja local*? It is like sending Santos Vega to Sunday school! The way of an Argentine man of letters is indeed hard; and while

he will not be permitted to describe the nation's life in all the vulgarisms of *lunfardo*, nor can discover a national idiom by codifying 'el lenguaje de Martín Fierro', still less can he hope to achieve Argentine verisimilitude within the covers of the Spanish Academy's dictionary. Sr Ocantos' worthy and craftsmanlike labour merely emphasises the gap, and already seems to have receded into history. It is period-work as remote from modern tastes and needs as the once laureate poems of Rafael Obligado.

There are many details of the opening chapter on 'The Literary Background' which I wish Mr Andersson had phrased differently. 'Beautiful' is hardly an epithet for either *Facundo* or its quarrelsome author, and one holds one's breath when Ricardo Palma is described as 'indigenous and primitive'. The whole chapter is too exclusively in the debt of Argentine critics, and tends to confuse 'Argentine' and 'Spanish American'. It is doubtless for that reason that the purely local Echeverría is credited with the proclamation of Americanism, to the neglect of Bello, who not only declared the need for an American literature, but detailed the possible subjects. Modernism is not merely an adaptation of French verse (p. 10), but even more (and perhaps only this permanently) a rediscovery of the possibilities of Spanish which had been buried under an academic tradition. When estimating French influence on Argentine literature and life, mention should always be made of the French dominions who fled from Louis Napoleon to set up a minor Paris on the Plate, and of the Ollendorffs and Garniers who have circulated for decades more French books than Spanish. Mr Andersson has overlooked the extremely valuable work of Dr Rudolph Grossmann, which contains so much more instructive matter than its title suggests, *Das ausländische Sprachgut im Spanischen des Río de la Plata*.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD

*Romance in Iceland*. By MARGARET SCHLAUCH. Princeton: University Press (Princeton American Scandinavian Foundation). 1934. 201 pp. \$ 2.00.

In this work Miss Schlauch has provided the first general treatment of the Icelandic *lyggsögur* or 'lying sagas', a branch of the literature which, up to now, has received little attention. This fact is, indeed, little to be wondered at, when it is considered how small a part of this great mass of literature is as yet available in print, and that few students have the opportunity to study it in the original MSS.

This the author has done, and her work must be commended as an admirable survey and as an indication of the course which future research must take. She approaches the subject as a student of comparative literature, and not primarily for the sake of its æsthetic or literary value, about which she is remarkably dispassionate. With her wide knowledge, she is able to discuss sources and parallels, not only from classical and romance literatures, but no less from Slavonic and Celtic. Nevertheless, it may be felt that some of the views which she expresses are misleading

or, at least, questionable. In the fantastic and unrestrained tales of the *lygisogur* she sees a bond with the most classical of the Family Sagas. As she remarks, the latter too sometimes introduced trolls and magic spells and other religious information, 'which may heighten the dramatic effect, but which does not heighten the reader's credulity'. Consequently she suggests that 'the earliest sagas contain a few of the elements which were later exploited to the exclusion of all others'. For the authors of both groups (she tells us) wrote 'from the lofty position of true believers'. Nevertheless, even if our credulity, in the rationalistic sense, is not heightened by (shall we say) the *kveldrða* of 'Eyrbyggja Saga', yet the story is in some way convincing. This indeed is hardly remarkable, for the author himself was convinced of the truth of his story, Christian though he was. It is evident that when the Icelanders were taught Christianity, they were led to believe, not that the gods were a myth, but that Christ was stronger than they, though they were powerful demons. It is equally clear that such beliefs persisted, at least, into the twelfth century. Only when they became sophisticated did the Icelanders begin to write of the gods in the light-hearted manner of the *lygisogur*.

It remains only to praise Miss Schlauch's work, which will prove useful to all students of Icelandic. It is to be hoped that subsequent editions will explain or alter a number of peculiar spellings found throughout the work, e.g., *Hálfðánnr*, *Trojumanna saga*.

G. TURVILLE-PETRE.

OXFORD.

## SHORT NOTICES

The latest addition to Methuen's *Old English Library* (*The Dream of the Rood*, edited by B. DICKINS and A. S. C. ROSS. London: Methuen. 1934. xii + 50 pp. 2s.) maintains the high standard set by its predecessors, so that this edition of *The Dream of the Rood*, with its parallel texts of the Ruthwell and Brussels Crosses, will be welcomed by all those who have hitherto been forced to rely for class work upon the imperfectly glossed and incomplete version in Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, or the somewhat too speculative edition of Cook. An admirable and concise Introduction gives full details of the texts and their linguistic characteristics; then the texts follow, with interesting notes. Mainly, the Ruthwell Cross text corresponds to that given in Baldwin Brown's *The Arts in Early England*, vol. v, with a few corrections such as *giwundad* (l. 62). The Vercelli text of *The Dream* has been followed faithfully, and retained wherever possible. One interesting feature is the retention here of the capitals of the MS.—justifiable except perhaps in l. 23. The most interesting emendation is that of l. 9 (*engeldryhte*), and the MS. reading, hitherto discarded, of *guman* in l. 146 is justified. The most prominent notes are those on *forþgesceaft* (l. 10), *wæðrum* (l. 15), *fūs* (l. 21), *ðær* (l. 31), and *deorc* (l. 146). One might suggest for *onginnen* (l. 116) a comparison with *Beo.* 244, and

for the meaning (at least) of *lmwērg* (l. 64) a comparison with *Beo* 1586 (cf. *D R.* l. 101) The glossary, which resembles most closely that of Cook in its interpretations, has a few omissions—e.g. *bēam* (l. 6), *gebīdan* (l. 50), *earm* (l. 19), and *sorg* (l. 59)—but its use gives a more comprehensible and smoothly running translation than the glossary of any other edition.

A. M.

All students will benefit from the publication of Mr V. H. Galbraith's Oxford lectures on archives (*An Introduction to the use of the Public Records* Oxford: Clarendon Press 1934 112 pp 5s) This little book, with its modest title, will carry the reader a long way towards mastery of the use of records, if it is carefully read and its directions put into practice. It is an admirable combination of historical survey, fundamental principles, and practical guidance. Mr Galbraith, forbidding short cuts, lays his finger upon essentials, e.g. the necessity of intimate understanding of administrative procedure and machinery, in the proper use of archives. His own intimacy is apparent in every page of this book. And it is this basic principle which explains why the greater part of his space is taken up with mediæval archives. The fourth chapter, however, leads on to later centuries. And the final chapter, practical counsel upon 'The Approach to Research', is a remarkable piece of compressed expertness. I do not think I can entirely accept Mr Galbraith's views upon the transcription of documents for printing. But general agreement upon this point is hardly possible. And there is much to be said for the compromise offered by the practice of Public Record Office publications, which he advocates. Altogether, it is a most helpful and scholarly book.

C. J. S.

The essay from which Mr Alfred Hart's book takes its title (*Shakespeare and the Homilies* Melbourne University Press. 1934. 262 pp 8s. 6d.) draws very interesting parallels between the political doctrines asserted in the official *Homilies* and those which pervade the plays and seem to be peculiarly characteristic of Shakespeare's outlook. Mr Hart is careful not to detract from the significance of this outlook, while making it reasonably clear that Shakespeare was familiar with the homilies. The second section of the book contains a reprint of three important articles upon 'Play Abridgment, the length of Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays', with their vindication of the two hours' duration of the Elizabethan play and other conclusions more open to debate but cogently argued. Then follows a discussion of the problem of censorship in 2 *Henry IV*, and two essays embodying a study of the vocabulary of *Edward III* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, in an attempt to decide the question of authorship, in both cases arguing in favour of an extension of the canon. Mr Hart, in the technique of this investigation, is no mere arithmetician, and his method repays study, even if it does not convince here. Altogether, there is much food for thought in these essays, and the evidence of a critical and well-informed mind at work in an original manner.

I am not happy about Mr Hart's insistence that Elizabeth bore among her subjects the personal 'nickname' of 'Richard II' (pp 159-62 and elsewhere), a very different interpretation of the facts from the general observation of parallels to be drawn

C. J. S.

Massinger's *City-Madam* (Edited by R. Kirk, Princeton University Press, London H. Milford 1934 183 pp \$7) suffers very much from being a thesis. The introduction sums up the opinions of former critics but adds little of any value, and it is not infrequently casual and ill-informed on the literary history of the period. Thus Dr Kirk naively suggests that the name Sir John Frugal was substituted for Sir John Rich because 'the actors decided that Frugal was a better name' (p. 149). Similar name changes in *The Ball* and *Wit in a Constable* coupled with the activities of the Master of the Revels should have suggested to Dr Kirk a more plausible hypothesis. Additional evidence in favour of a late date of composition might have been adduced from the vogue for references to almanacs and astrology during and after the publication of John Booker's almanacs, 1630-34, and from the satire on aspiring citizens' wives which almost hardened into a dramatic convention in the thirties. Two plays, *Wit in a Constable* and *The City Match*, which show the influence of *The City Madam*, are mentioned. Mention might also have been made of Davenant's *The Wits*, where the influence is at least as strongly marked. The grammar of the second sentence of the introduction is not above reproach.

J. H. W.

Mr R. Leshe-Melville's *The Life and Work of Sir John Fielding* (London: Lincoln Williams, 1934 xv+323 pp 12s. 6d.), the first biography of Henry Fielding's half-brother (1721-80), is primarily a vindication of the blind Bow Street magistrate's integrity and an exposition of his services towards the reform of the police and the magistracy. Apart from the accident of his having been related to the novelist, he scarcely impinges on literature, for his few writings, with the possible exception of *The Universal Mentor* (1763), are not of general interest. Such other literary contacts as he has are magisterial—the binding over of Casanova to keep the peace, the suppression of illegal performances at the theatres within his jurisdiction, and his efforts to persuade Garrick and Colman not to present the subversive *Beggars' Opera* at their houses.

F. E. B.

Dr J. H. Harder is primarily concerned with the growth of humanitarianism in his *Observations on some tendencies of Sentiment and Ethics in Minor Poetry and Essay in the Eighteenth Century until the execution of Dr W. Dodd in 1777* (Amsterdam: M. J. Portielje, 1933. 320 pp.) His introductory discussion of seventeenth-century writers leads him to the depressing conclusion that charitable and Utopian thoughts, equally with blank despair, take their rise from melancholy. Thereafter, in his extensive survey of the minor writers of the eighteenth century, he moves rapidly over a great variety of topics united only by a common element of gloom. This, no doubt, is the fault of the material of his choice, but he



does nothing to lighten the atmosphere by his digressions into the statistics of suicides and kindred matters. The variety of topics is itself a defect, partly because it obscures the main issue and partly because Dr Harder is unwilling to omit from any of his forty-five chapters a single one of the many illustrative quotations or references that he has found. Too often the pages read as if they had been set up direct from a card-index. Even the author's own remarks are sometimes in note form, and his curious abbreviations of names and titles are not pleasing.

F. E. B.

*Essays by Divers Hands* (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, New Series, XIII, Edited by W. B. Maxwell 1934 London: H. Milford. XIII + 133 pp. 7s.) contains seven essays of somewhat unequal value. Mr R. Ellis Roberts discusses Charles Lamb in a charmingly personal and desultory Elian manner. The late Professor de Montmorency, in outlining the influence of jurisprudence on English thought, pays tribute to the work of Bacon, Selden and Hobbes. Mr R. H. Mottram relates pleasantly but sketchily the careers of some of the men of letters of Norwich. He should, however, recall that Robert Greene's 'cock' was black and cried, 'Caw'. Mr Bonamy Dobrée, in his provocative and valuable essay, 'The Novel: Has it a Function Today?', offers a stimulating challenge to modern novelists. Mr H. B. Walters writes with affectionate humour on 'Some English Antiquaries', and Professor V. de Sola Pinto finds much to praise, and rightly so, in the poems of the Earl of Rochester. Mr Maxwell concisely reviews the whole collection in his introduction. He seems a little uncertain, though, about Professor de Sola Pinto's name.

J. H. W.

The second volume of *Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages* (Kendal: Titus Wilson and Son 1933 88 pp. 5s.) is dedicated to the memory of Joseph Wright. It contains eight articles, several short notes and abstracts of two theses presented for the M.A. degree at Leeds University. Perhaps the most interesting article is one by Mr Wilson on 'Lost Literature in Old and Middle English', which is an excellent supplement to Professor Chambers' work on the same subject. Mr Brook discusses the original dialects of the Harley Lyrics, and Professor Bruce Dickins the date of the Ireland MS. An article by Dr Smith on O.Scand. *lundr* and one by E. S. Olszewska on 'Norse formulas in English' are both further evidence of the excellent work done by graduates of this University for Old Norse study. Mr Ross writes with his usual freshness on 'The Subdivisions of Philology' and on 'the interpretation of the statistics of variant forms in philology'. While it is doubtful whether it is possible, even in philology, to 'conquer all mysteries by rule and line', the article does serve as a warning against the danger of deductions, apparently safe and logical, drawn from the preponderance of particular forms of words occurring in any text.

Professor Bruce Dickins and his Department are to be congratulated on this volume.

G. N. G.

Not only French teachers, but also the far wider public which seeks knowledge or recreation through French, are in the debt of M. Abel and Mme Chevalley for compiling the *Concise Oxford French Dictionary* (Oxford Clarendon Press. 1934. xx+895 pp 7s 6d.) The general plan and appearance is that of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, with the addition of a list of irregular verbs and illustrations of motor and aeroplane parts, steam and sailing ships, and architectural terms. Each word is followed by a phonetic transcription, and the etymon is given, when securely known, mainly for the purpose of avoiding false etymologies. The notion of 'current' language extends to cover the literature of the last three centuries, present-day technical terms, and also slang, in so far as the latter shows signs of permanence. Great care has been taken to provide real equivalents for French words and phrases, avoiding unidiomatic paraphrase, and danger signs appear on many of the pages to warn us against 'false friends'. The book is light in the hand, and as well bound and produced as we expect from the Oxford Press. It will find its way to the study table of every scholar. W. J. E.

The new edition of Pierre Martino's *Stendhal* (Paris: Boivin (1934). 318 pp. 30 francs) appears opportunely within a year or so of the time (1935) when the author of the *Chartreuse* predicted that he would come into such fame and recognition as was to be his. To some extent Stendhal's prediction has been realised and to some extent falsified. He is, to-day, one of the favourite bones for modern scholars; and he is no nearer being widely popular than he was in his own day. The most obvious changes in Martino's excellent book are in paper, print, pictures, price and such like externals. The 1914 edition was in the usual format in which we expect to find our criticisms of French literature, with paper and letterpress to match the price of twelve francs; and there were no pictures. The present edition, completed by the author in 1934 (and published without date) has a fine portrait of Stendhal and several other illustrations. Except that it does not aspire to cardboard, it emulates the respectability of an English text. And the price is thirty francs. A comparison of the two editions shows that the chapters are unchanged, so that the phrase 'complètement remaniée et refondue' has to be read with discretion. In the contents of one or two of the chapters there is no alteration at all. On the other hand, the reader will find with dismay that the useful notes of the first edition have disappeared; and he will also seek in vain for a list of the critical and other works on which Martino has based such emendations of his text as he has deemed necessary. There was no index in 1914 and there is none now. The new material has to be sought for in the body of the text. There is a little in Chapter I (p. 9 f. and p. 25). In Chapter II (p. 52) a few details have been added concerning Stendhal's projected *Vie de Napoléon* and in IV there is some restatement and addition (esp. pp. 60 ff.) in the light of fuller knowledge of Stendhal's tampering with drama. On pp. 147 ff. begins a more explicit statement of the circumstances of origin of *Racine et Shakespeare*, of the two consecutive versions and of the manner in which the text was encumbered with

material taken haphazard from Stendhal's manuscripts. In the remainder of the book the changes are very slight indeed. In the main, of course, that is because the first edition was a very mature and competent piece of work, written with extraordinary detachment and lucidity. It is sound literary history; and if it is still disappointing as criticism and explanation, that is because the history and the criticism of literature are anti-thetic and mutually destructive genres.

Another study of Stendhal, by Mr Manuel Brussaly, is the work of a less experienced author. His *Political Ideas of Stendhal* (New York. Inst. French Studies. xiii + 233 pp. \$2) abruptly reaches its final conclusions in the introduction and is of the kind more useful to the author than to the reader. But it has some struggling merit and may lead to better things  
D. G. L.

In *Towards Hérodade* (Melbourne: University Press, and Oxford. University Press 1934. 174 pp. 6s)—a little book, big with ideas—Mr A. R. Chisholm makes an important contribution to the history of French poetry in the later nineteenth century. The Baudelaire literature is ever increasing in volume, and Baudelaire appears more and more distinctly as one of the master minds of his age. M. Pommier, in his book *La Mystique de Baudelaire*, rightly drew attention to the resemblances between Baudelaire and Renan. But Baudelaire is the Hamlet of Faith: rationalism does not exist for him, and that at once separates him from Renan. Baudelaire was brought up by a devout mother, and though he may declare he has lost his faith, or may appear to blaspheme, he is nevertheless ever God-ridden. For him the question is not 'Should I believe?' but 'How can I enter into direct communication with God?' The so-called German influence upon him must therefore not be exaggerated.

Hamlet he is too in his attitude towards his mother, and probably the first of the moderns to regard his mother as the most important factor in his young destiny. Viewed in that light Mallarmé's *Hérodiade* becomes clothed in a fresh significance, even more important than that attributed to it by Mr Chisholm in his most interesting chapter. If love as Baudelaire and Mallarmé interpret it is really a cosmic drama, then *Hérodiade* and *La Jeune Parque*, the two poems of the debate between pride and desire, virginity and sensuality, will and vital instinct, narcissism and charitable understanding, self and non-self, are the necessary climax of the Baudelairean doctrine.

The French nineteenth century is in disgrace with some of the critics. The dog has been given a bad name and there is no lack of hangmen. 'What a century!' exclaims Mr Chisholm, but not in admiration. Dionysos walks these pages, but Thalia was not bidden to the feast.

G. R. T.

The last number of the *Deutsches Dante-Jahrbuch* (16 Band. Neue Folge, 7 Band. Edited by Friedrich Schneider. Weimar: Bohlaus. 1934. 255 pp. 14 RM.) contains some interesting articles besides the Editor's informative survey of Dantean publications in Germany. Dr Friedrich

Wagner traces the influence and echoes, direct and indirect, of Dante's political views in works written by Germans and by natives of other countries writing in Germany. His monograph provides a useful chapter in what Italians would call *la fortuna di Dante in Germania* from 1477 to 1699. In more instances than one it is open to doubt whether the authors mentioned were directly familiar with Dante's views, but Dr Wagner, who has rightly aimed at completeness, is careful to call attention to the actual position of each of the authors he considers. The article *Florenz zur Zeit Dantes*, which gives the substance of an address delivered by Dr Alfred Doren at the meeting of the society at Weimar, September 23-24, 1934, is as lucid and authoritative a survey as the name of its author would lead us to expect. There are minor contributions such as an address by H. E. Ulrich v. Hassell, the German ambassador in Rome, at the Casa di Dante (January 28, 1934), and one by Prince Johann Georg duke of Saxony delivered at Weimar in 1933, on the duke's grandfather, Philaletes, and his work on Dante, he appears to have become acquainted with O'Taaffe at Pisa in 1822, who was also then translating the *Commedia*. Of little interest is the laborious and scarcely conclusive thesis by Dr Annelise Gloth on metaphorical expressions based on words indicating family relationship, on the contrary, the essay *Mittelalter und Renaissance in Dantes Commedia* is deserving of attention and study, for Dr Eduard Wechsler, after a searching analysis of many passages, points out that in Dante's works the Renaissance was already finding a clear expression, there are many telling remarks throughout this article side by side with surprising assertions such as 'Das *Convivio* ist wie often, der treue Spiegel für Dantes eigene Ueberzeugung'. A closer familiarity with other than purely German works would probably have suggested to Dr Wechsler to express some of his conclusions in a more cautious form. There is also a note on *Inf.* XII, 120, by William Mathie, in which the different interpretations are surveyed.

C. F.

*The Comedy of Dante Alighieri, Part I, Hell* (New York: The Harbor Press. 1934. 134 pp. \$2.50) is a revised edition of Mr Louis How's translation of the *Inferno* first published in 1920. Based originally on Moore's text (1906), and Camerini's, the translation has not been revised by reference, e.g., to Vandelli, but apparently only by further study of Moore and Scartazzini, whom the translator still refers to as 'the established authorities'. Even so he is, obviously, often not translating the text they print. But the translation is evidently not addressed to scholars. In form, for instance, though he has adopted Dante's stanza, Mr Howe has clearly made no study of it as employed by Dante himself. He keeps to the rhyme-scheme and no more. His aim has been to produce a 'readable version' for 'American' (not English) readers who wish 'to feel to some extent the same poetical effect that Dante makes on Italians'. Anxious to avoid a 'Parnassian' style, he makes free use of American colloquial idiom and slang vocabulary and thereby reproduces, it is true, much of the raciness and strength of certain passages of the original, but only at the cost of a marked lowering, at times vulgarisation, of its general

tone Inaccurate renderings, misplaced emphasis, excess of padding, over-insistent rhymes, mechanical rhythms, cacophonies (like 'Halfway along the path of *this existence*') and the frequent substitution of flat prose for inspired poetry are other faults of this translation. But, for all that, it is eminently readable because of one outstanding merit—its vigour.

G. L. B.

The *Operette morali* has met from the beginning with less favour than any of Leopardi's other works, on the contrary, the poet himself showed a partiality for this series of dialogues that he never evinced for the best among his poems. In recent years no less an authority than Gentile has endeavoured to stress its importance in the history of Leopardi's philosophical development, maintaining that far from being occasional diversions with no strong link with one another, the different items form a coherent work, at least in their original nucleus, which constitutes an organic, if complex, expression of Leopardi's philosophical thought. But this theory has not met with general approval, and the *Operette*, comparatively, still lacks popularity. Doubtless this is due to the difficulty which unprepared readers experience in grasping the full meaning of what Leopardi meant to convey, no less than to the discouraging views which he expressed. There is no fully annotated edition of this work, and notes as well as long introductions have proved inadequate helps in bringing the *Operette* within the range of the general reader or, at least, of the lover of good literature. In English there is an excellent translation by James Thompson, but it has not helped to make this work sufficiently well known. And it is to be hoped that the running commentary which Professor Giulio Reichenbach has written (*Studi sulle operette morali di Giacomo Leopardi*. Firenze La nuova Italia. 1934. 223 pp. 10 lire) may achieve what earlier attempts have proved incapable of producing. The author gives a minute history of Leopardi's work and a careful analysis of each of the *Operette* in a language as terse as his thought is lucid. He holds, and I think rightly, that these dialogues and essays possess artistic rather than philosophic unity. It was Leopardi's object to give fantastic expression to the result of his long meditations about humanity, life, pleasure and *nora*; and he aimed at endowing Italian literature, in so doing, with a kind of satirical prose of which there was no earlier example. And though no claims to uniform perfection are made by Professor Reichenbach for the prose style of this work, he succeeds in showing its remarkable adherence to the thoughts and moods of the author, and its effectiveness in such sections as contain the most penetrating views of Leopardi.

C. F.

Viani's edition of Leopardi's letters will be superseded by the new edition which Professor Francesco Moroncini is producing (*Epistolario di Giacomo Leopardi* a cura di F. Moroncini. Florence: Le Monnier. Vol. I: xxvii + 325 pp. 1934. Vol. II. 311 pp. 1935. 25 lire each). The first two volumes have already appeared in rapid succession, and the other four are to follow at short intervals, there is enough in the first two to show

how great an advance has been made. Not indeed that many letters are added, for by now it must be assumed that practically all still extant letters have been traced; but with few exceptions all have been collated with the originals and more uniformly edited, and all are annotated with truly remarkable care. Leopardi, owing to his loneliness and innate disposition, was a profuse writer, and the charm and warmth of his correspondence reveal a side of the poet that is expressed only in part in his poems and scarcely at all in his prose works. But it is equally well known that much in his letters concerns minor events in his family circle, articles that he proposed to write or wrote and later condemned, corrections that his correspondents suggested to him, so that many of his letters are somewhat obscure and can be fully understood only through patient comparisons with biographical studies, the *Zibaldone* and other works of his; and despite careful research a reader, and even a well-informed reader, is likely to miss the point of what Leopardi has written. Thanks to Moroncini this will happen no longer. He has already provided ample proof of his tireless accuracy and zeal in his exemplary editions of Leopardi's variants; now he places under a deep debt not only specialised scholars but all who are interested in human nature and in great poets, for there is nothing that Moroncini does not explain in his very full and very concise notes. He has done still more, for he has traced and printed in smaller type a vast number of letters written to Leopardi, and as his correspondents were men of the calibre of Giordani, Monti and Maj, the correspondence becomes as vivid and interesting as a novel, and throws much light not only on Leopardi's linguistic study but on the views that he and his correspondents held on points of literature and language. Of course some of these letters had been printed before in other works, but the advantage of having them set down immediately after or before Leopardi's own is immense, particularly as the notes fill such gaps as still may remain. It is difficult to praise this edition as highly as it deserves to be. It is a model edition worthy of Leopardi, and the more welcome because recent Italian criticism has not seemed to take kindly to works of this kind. The printing is excellent. C. F.

Sr Aramon i Serra has brought together five brief and ingenuous devout tales from the Middle Ages in his *Novel·letes Exemplars* (Coll. Els Nostres Classics. Barcelona: Barcino. 187 pp. 7.50 ptas.). Two are tales of the *Manekine* cycle, representing virtuous women who resist incestuous proposals, and within that type they belong to the variant denoted as 'of the senator'. They are *La filla del rey d'Ungria* and *La filla del emperador Costanti*. The virtuous wife who resists a brother-in-law's proposals, but is believed guilty by her husband, combines with some other adventures of injured innocence in *La comtessa fidel*, sublimely extravagant friendship appears in *Ams e Melis*; and *Lo fill del senescal d'Egipte* shows a traitor caught in his own snare, together with improving scenes from hermit life. It contains still the pious exordium which gives the story the flavour of a sermon. The tales have been published before, but are here reproduced from the manuscripts, whose spelling has been respected.

Unfortunately this appears to have put too heavy a strain on the printers. The style is ingenuous, and only once—in an episode of *La comtessa fidel*—do we meet with an incident that savours of real life. An introduction gives the necessary references to critical literature. Rojas Zorrilla's *Santa Isabel, reina de Portugal*, takes its *dénouement* from the *Fil del Senescal* cycle, and Doña María de Zayas uses the *Comtessa fidel* motif for her novel *La perseguida triunfante* W. J. E.

Dr Maria Heseler's dissertation, *Studien zur Figur des gracioso bei Lope de Vega und Vorgängern* (Hildesheim: Borgmeyer. 1933 132 pp. No price stated), is addressed to a vexed question. The term, admittedly untranslatable, and the character occur in Spain some three-quarters of a century before Lope, but not in his immediate predecessors and not in his own earliest plays: hence the assumption of external stimuli. Dr Heseler begins with Plautus and Terence, in whose servant characters may be seen, combined or in isolation, most of the accepted traits of the *gracioso*, traces these on through Ariosto and Aretino, and presents us with a Q.E.D. It may be remarked that, granted the principle of persistent—and not, as in Shakespeare, intermittent—comic relief, for which, given the Spanish footing of intimacy, the servant is clearly indicated, there is a limit to possible humorous devices. Falstaff is a knight; discount this, and the most notable figure in English comedy answers strikingly to practically all the *gracioso*'s traits (Parodie der Haupthandlung, Beteiligung an der Handlung, Realismus, Spott, Zynismus, Bildung, Kenntnisse der Antike, Vorwitz, Witzige Sprache besonders durch lustige Anekdoten, Wortspiele und Wiederholungen, Prahlerei und Feigheit, Kritik an den Frauen, Kritik an den Zeitverhältnissen, Habgier, Esslust, runs Dr Heseler's list). Another difficulty in the proposition is one of links. If Lope's *gracioso* could have developed from the earlier *pastor* and *bobo* but, in view of the chronological gap and of certain ambiguous statements by the author, is not to be so regarded, the admission of this other line of descent seems to require unambiguous references to Plautus and the others plus evidence of their direct impact on Lope's mind shortly after he began to write. Such evidence is not here adduced.

This more satisfying method of approach may be seen applied in Professor E. B. Place's recent essay, 'Does Lope de Vega's *gracioso* stem in part from Harlequin?' (*Hispania*, October 1934), in which he argues for a basic similarity of traits in the Harlequin of the *commedia dell' arte*, notes that Ganassa and his troupe performed in Spain during the formative period of the *gracioso lopesco* (the dates are not as convincing as could be desired—1593 would appear to see Lope's earliest *gracioso*, whereas Ganassa's visits can be traced from 1574 to 1584 and again possibly in 1603), and establishes by quotation that Lope was impressed by their performances.

The body of Dr Heseler's study is a pursuit of the *gracioso*'s various traits through Lope's theatre, it soon becomes a catalogue of quotations, with little comment and thus ingenuous. An appendix lists seventeenth-century actors who appeared in the role. A second transcribes the titles

of Lope's plays, noting the presence or absence of comic figures. The arrangement, by *Partes*, not chronologically—dates are noted in the margin—does not lend itself to inferences, and Dr Heseler draws none.  
W. C. A.

Wilhelm von Humboldt died on April 8, 1835, and in preparation for the centenary of one whose scientific curiosity has proved so momentous to the Basques Dr Justo Gárate has gathered together and translated into Spanish a number of Humboldt's opuscula, some from the *Gesammelte Schriften*, but others from manuscripts. Dr Gárate's *G. de Humboldt: Estudio de sus trabajos sobre Vasconia* (Bilbao: Imprenta Provincial. 1933. xv + 222 pp. No price stated) omits the *Urbewohner Spaniens* and the additions and corrections to Adelung's *Mithridates* which are already in Spanish dress, as his purpose is to complete the tale of Humboldt's Basque efforts. He gives a bibliography which adds to Vinson, and relates the voyages of 1799 and 1801 out of Humboldt's diaries, letters and sketches, correcting some of Farnelli's allegations; apart from this personal matter, there are a number of grammatical projects, none of which go very far. One notices that Humboldt did not feel certain of the absolute want of *f* in true Basque, while he knew that the Basques had not failed to learn the sound in Latin words—a point often overlooked by substratum theorists. What he has to say concerning the noun is more satisfying than his treatment of the verb; in fact Humboldt's projects fade out as he approaches the latter. He remarks in one place that there are 216 conjugations and that Astarloa's treatment was definitive. Astarloa's work remains in manuscript in a Berlin library, and it is good, in view of Humboldt's praise, to learn that Dr Gárate will give us an edition. An interesting section of this work consists of Humboldt's summary reviews of a number of old printed and manuscript grammars and dictionaries.  
W. J. E.

In *Grundzüge der Sprachnormung in der Technik* (Berlin. V.D.I.-Verlag. 1934) Dr E. Wüster gives us an epitome of an extensive work entitled *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik*, which appeared in 1931 and received well-deserved tributes in many philological as well as technological journals. After a concise survey of the attempts of the various languages of civilisation to standardise their technical nomenclatures—electricity being the chief branch discussed in this connexion—and to equate the definitions of the standard terms finally selected in each language with those given in the other languages, the author reaches the irresistible conclusion that the only satisfactory issue from the present chaos is the adoption and adaptation for international technical purposes of a 'Plansprache', i.e., a planned constructed language like Esperanto. In spite of its brevity the book is full of useful statistical data clearly and systematically presented and offers a wealth of valuable and original material for the consideration of all who are interested in modern trends of linguistic evolution.  
W. E. C.



## NEW PUBLICATIONS

April—June 1935

With the collaboration of Dr MARY S SERJEANTSON (English),  
Dr A. GILLIES and Dr F P PICKERING (German)

### GENERAL

- ALFORD, VIOLET, and R. GALLOP, *The Traditional Dance*. London, Methuen 6s  
Bibliography on the Survival of the Classics, A, ed. The Warburg Institute.  
Vol 1 London, Cassell 21s
- BLOOMFIELD, L, *Language*. London, Allen and Unwin. 15s
- BOFF, L., *Esquisse d'un traité du roman* Paris, Nouv rev fr 18 fr.
- Columbia Books, 1893-1933 Columbia Univ Press
- GLASENAPP, GR VON, *Abhandlungen über aktuelle Fragen aus der Psychologie, Mathematik und Religion, III* (including Sprachmusik in der deutschen und italienischen Lyrik—Die Entstehung des Romans und der Novelle auf dem Boden Italiens) Leipzig, Heims 4 M
- Guerre di Rodi, Le, 1480-1522, sel. docs. trsl E F. Mizzi Turin, Soc. Ediz. Internazionale. L 8
- HAAG, K., *Das Denkgerüst der Sprache* Heidelberg, Winter. 1 M.
- HUJER, O, *Jazyk (Czech language and dialects)*. Prague, Sfinx
- HUMBOLDT, W VON, *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues*. Berlin, Schneider (facsimile) 9 M 80
- LORENTOWICZ, J, et A. M. CHMURSKI, *La Pologne en France* (Bibl. Polonaise, IV) Paris, Champion. 40 fr
- MANENT, M., *Notes sobre literatura estrangera* Barcelona, La Revista 4 ptas. 50
- MAROUZEAU, J, *Traité de stylistique appliquée au latin* Paris, Belles Lettres. 40 fr.
- Musique et chanson populaires Paris, Stock. 20 fr.
- SAVKOVITCH, M, *L'Influence du réalisme français dans le roman serbo-croate* (Bibl. RLC, 107). Paris, Champion. 60 fr.
- SERVIEN, P, *Principes d'esthétique* (Bibl. RCC). Paris, Boivin 18 fr.
- STEFFEN, A, *Dramaturgische Beiträge zu den schonen Wissenschaften*. Dornach, Verlag f. schone Wiss 4 M.
- UNBEGAUN, B, *La Langue russe au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Bibl. Inst. Fr. Leningrad, 16) Paris, Hachette. 70 fr.
- UNBEGAUN, B., *Les Débuts de la langue littéraire chez les serbes* (Inst. Ét. Slave, 15) Paris, Champion 25 fr.
- WILLIAMS, I. A, *English folk-song and dance*. London, Longmans 3s. 6d.

### ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

- GAMILLSCHEG, E., *Romania germanica, II* (Grund germ. Phil.). Berlin, De Gruyter. 13 M.

### Mediaeval Latin.

- DESMARAIS, M. M., *S. Albert le Grand*. Paris, Vrin. 20 fr.
- GILSON, E., *Saint Thomas Aquinas* (British Academy). Oxford Univ. Press. 1s. 6d.

**Italian.**

- ALTROCCHI, R., Deceptive cognates Italian-English and English-Italian. Chicago and Cambridge Univ Presses 3s 6d
- AMARI, M., Storia dei musulmani di Sicilia, 2 ed rev C. A. Nallino, vol. II. Catania, Prampolini L 100
- ANKERSMIT, M., Die Namen des Leuchtkaufers im Italienischen. Diss. Zurich, Leeman
- APOSTOLITI, P., Mignosi narratore Catania, Studio ed. moderno L. 5
- ARIOSTO, Le Satire, ed. A. Di Vita (Classici Italiani) Turin, Paravia L 3 25.
- Autori d'oggi. Rome, La Battuta Critica. L 14
- BANDELLO, Tutte le Opere, I, ed F. Flora. Milan, Mondadori L 40.
- BREGLIA, S., Poesia e struttura della Divina Commedia Genoa, E. degli Orfini L 12
- BRUNO, F., Grazia Deledda, studio critico. Salerno, Di Giacomo L. 30
- BURDACH, K., Die Sammlung kleiner lateinischen Gelegenheitsgedichte Petrarca's. Berlin, De Gruyter 1 M
- CARDUCCI, Juvenilia e Levia Gravia (Ediz. Naz., II) Bologna, Zanichelli L 16.
- CARDUCCI, Primi versi (Ediz. Naz., I). Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 16.
- CARDUCCI, Prose scelte, ed. Bianchi e Nediani. Bologna, Zanichelli L. 15
- CARLI, P., ed A. SAINATI, Politici e critici dell'età moderna Florence, Le Monnier. L 8
- CAZZAMINI MUSSI, F., Il Giornalismo a Milano dal quarantotto al novecento Como, Cavalleri. L 12.
- CELLINI, B., Il Teatro di Pirandello. Rome, Museo L 5.
- CHARLIER, G., Machiavel Paris, Renaissance du Livre 5 fr 50
- CHEREL, A., La Pensée de Machiavel en France. Paris, Artisan du Livre. 30 fr.
- CIONE, E., L'Estetica di Francesco De Sanctis Florence, Barbera L 15.
- Cronisti del trecento, ed. R. Palmarocchi (I Classici). Milan, Rizzoli L. 30.
- D'ANNUNZIO, Crestomazia della lirica, ed. E. Palmieri Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 15.
- DAVID, M., La Prima 'Institutio' umanistica femminile: 'De Studijs et Litteris' di Leonardo Bruni Aretino Turin, L'Impronta L 3
- DELLA SALA, V., Ottocentisti meridionali. Naples, Guida L. 18.
- DOLCI, G., Oriani. Padua, La Garangola. L 2.
- D'ORAZIO, D., A. Borghese e il dramma dello spirito contemporaneo. Venice, S. Marco. L. 8.
- Enciclopedia italiana, XXV: NOUG-PALEN. Rome, Treccani.
- FATTORELLO, F., Il Giornalismo italiano nei periodi della sua storia. Tolmezzo, Carnia.
- FERRETTI, G., I due Tempi della composizione della Divina Commedia (Bibl. Cultura moderna). Bari, Laterza. L. 30
- FESTA, N., Umanesimo. Milan, Hoepli. L. 12.
- FOSCOLO, U., Poesie, prose e lettere, ed N. Vaccalluzzo. Turin, Lattes. L 19.
- FUCILLA, J. G., and J. M. CARRIÈRE, D'Annunzio abroad, a bibliographical essay. New York, Inst. Fr. Stud \$2 25
- FUMAGALLI, A., Il Lirismo del Pascoli. Florence, Nuova Italia L. 12.
- GIUFFRÈ, L., Il Problema delle Ombre e delle Luci nella Divina Commedia. Palermo, Trimarchi. L. 12.
- GIUSSO, L., Leopardi e le sue due ideologie. Florence, Sansoni L. 12
- GOLDONI, Commedie (La famiglia dell'antiquario—La locandiera), ed. M. Lombardo Lotti. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 6

- GOLDONI, *Le Smanie per la villeggiatura*, ed. G. Avancini. Milan, Vallardi. L. 2 75.
- GOLDONI, *Mémoires (texte original français)* Milan, Mondadori L. 40
- GOLDONI, *Tutte le Opere*, ed. G. Ortolani, I Milan, Mondadori. L. 40.
- GUSTARELLI, A., *D'Annunzio, l'uomo, il poeta, il prosatore* Milan, Vallardi L. 8
- HUDAL, A., *Die deutsche Kulturarbeit in Italien* Munster, Aschendorff 8 M 80.
- LIPPARINI, G., *Alfredo Oriani, delle opere (Scrittori Italiani)* Turin, Paravia. L. 5.
- MIGNOSI, P., *Il Secreto di Pirandello* Palermo, La Tradizione L. 12
- NATALI, G., *I Giorni e le opere di Giosuè Carducci* Rome, Signorelli L. 11.
- PALMIERI, E., *Giosuè Carducci* Rome, Formiggini. L. 5
- PANZINI, A., *Dizionario moderno delle parole che non si trovano nell' altri dizionari*, 7 ed. Milan, Hoepli L. 60
- PAOLILLO, M., *Le Poesie latine di Francesco Berni*. Lucera, Scepti L. 5
- PAPINI, G., *Grandezze di Carducci* Florence, Vallecchi L. 6.
- PASCOLI, G., *Myricae (Tutte le Opere)* Milan, Mondadori. L. 15
- PASQUALI, G., *Pagine meno stravaganti* Florence, Sansoni L. 15
- PEDRAZZI, C., *Riflessi storici nei novellieri del ducento e trecento* Bologna, Mareggiani
- PETRONIO, G., *Il Decamerone (Bibl. Cultura Moderna)*. Bari, Laterza L. 9.
- PORTIGLIOTTI, G., *Condottieri (Coll. Storica)* Milan, Treves. L. 15
- RIZZI, M., *Alberto Rondani, poeta e critico* Parma, Fresching L. 8
- ROBB, NESCA A., *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance* London, Allen and Unwin 12s. 6d.
- SANTINI, E., *Storia della letteratura italiana*. Palermo, Trimarchi L. 13
- SCIVITTARO, F., *Giosuè Carducci, poeta nazionale* Spoleto, Tip. dell' Umbria. L. 3.
- SIGNORILE, M., *Trent' anni di poesia italiana*, I Milan, Araldo Letterario. L. 6.
- SISMONDI, G. C., *Epistolario*, ed. C. Pellegrini, II. 1814-23 Florence, Nuova Italia. L. 26.
- TASSO, T., *Gerusalemme liberata*, ed. G. Ziccardi (Classici Italiani). Turin, Paravia. L. 12.
- TASSO, T., *Poesie*, ed. F. Flora (I Classici). Milan, Rizzoli. L. 30.
- TONELLI, L., *Tasso* Turin, Paravia. L. 11.
- VALLI, L., *Struttura morale dell' universo dantesco* Rome, Ausonia. L. 25
- VENEZIANI, A. DEL U., *Gaetano Negri*. Rome, Formiggini. L. 20.
- VERONA, F., *Sebastiano Bagolino, poeta e umanista alcamese*. Rome, Ausonia. L. 2.
- VITALI, G., *Giuseppe Giusti*. Milan, Vallardi L. 3.
- ZANELLA, G., *Liriche*, ed. M. Lupo Gentile. Milan, Vallardi. L. 3.

### Spanish, Catalan, Basque.

- ALCOVER, M., *El Islam en Mallorca (707-1232) y la cruzada pisano-catalana (1113-15)* Palma, Viuda de S. Piza 5 ptas.
- Alexandre, *El libro de*, ed. R. S. Willis (Elliott Monographs, 32) Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ Presses \$5.
- ALONSO CORTÉS, N., *Artículos histórico-literarios*. Valladolid, Impr. Castellana. 5 ptas.
- ALONSO GETINO, L. G., *Vida e ideario del Maestro Fray Pablo de León, verbo de las Comunidades castellanas*. Salamanca, Calatrava. 10 ptas.
- AZORÍN, *Lope en silueta*. Madrid, Aguirre 3 ptas.
- BARDON, M., *Cervantès*, 2 vols. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 5 fr. 50

- BARJA, C, Libros y autores contemporáneos New York, Stechert 12 ptas.
- BARREIRO, A J, La 'Historia del Nuevo Mundo' del P. Bernabé Cobo Madrid, Gráfica Universal
- BOUTHOUL, G., Ibn Khaldoun. Paris, Geuthner. 10 fr
- CANAL GÓMEZ, M., El Cancionero de Roma (Bibl Hispano-Italiana), 2 vols. Florence, Sansoni L 30
- CARAYON, M., Lope de Vega (Maîtres des Littératures). Paris, Rieder. 20 fr
- CASTAÑEDA, N., Coses evengudes en la ciutat y regne de Valencia. Diari de Mosén Juan Porcar, capellán de San Martín (1589-1629), II Madrid, Góngora 18 ptas
- Catálogo bibliográfico de la biblioteca cervantina Barcelona, Bosch 15 ptas
- COSÍO, J. M., y T MAZA SOLANO, Romancero popular de La Montaña, II. Santander, Lib Moderna 7 50 ptas.
- COUCEIRO FREIJOMIL, A., El Idioma gallego Barcelona 12 ptas
- DAIREAUX, M., etc, Initiation en Argentine Paris, Colin 12 fr
- DÍAZ DEL CASTILLO, B., Verdadera y notable relación del descubrimiento y conquista de la Nueva España y Guatemala, I, II (Bibl Goathemala, 10, 11) Guatemala, Tip. Nacional
- Economic literature of Latin America, a tentative bibliography, I Harvard and Oxford Univ Presses 17s.
- FERRAZ Y CASTÁN, V., Vocabulario del dialecto que se habla en Alta Ribagorza Madrid, Archivos 12 ptas.
- FUENTES Y GUZMÁN, Recordación florida... del reyno de Guatemala, I-III (Bibl. Goathemala, 6-8) Guatemala, Tip. Nacional.
- GAMERO, E., Galdós y su obra, I, II Madrid, Espasa-Calpe 13 ptas
- JARNÉS, B., Castelar (Vidas españolas, 45) Madrid, Espasa-Calpe 5 ptas.
- JOVELLANOS, Obras escogidas, I, II (Clásicos castellanos, 110-111). Madrid, Espasa-Calpe. 12 ptas.
- Libro viejo de la fundación de Guatemala (Bibl. Goathemala, 12) Guatemala, Tip. Nacional.
- LÓPEZ, A., La Imprenta en Galicia en el siglo XVI. Santiago, Eco Franciscano.
- LÓPEZ-PIÓ, J M., Poesies, 1910-35. Barcelona, Altés. 6 ptas.
- LULL, Libre de consolació d'ermità, ed. Margot Sponer Berlin, Collignon
- MACHALE, C. F., El Libro mayor del idioma: lucubraciones sobre el Diccionario oficial de la lengua. Madrid, Sánchez de Ocaña 5 ptas.
- MADARIAGA, S. DE, Don Quixote: an Introductory Essay in Psychology. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s 6d
- MAESTRE, E., Homenaje a Pereda. Madrid, Maestre.
- MARTÍNEZ FERRANDO, J. E., Archivo de la Corona de Aragón. Catálogo de la documentación relativa al antiguo reino de Valencia, I. Jaime I Madrid. 15 ptas.
- MENÉNDEZ PELAYO y RODRÍGUEZ MARÍN, Epistolario, 1891-1912. Madrid, Bermejo. 10 ptas.
- MOLINOS, Guida spirituale, ed G. Marone (I Grandi Scrittori Stranieri). Turin, U T E T. L. 12.
- PAGÈS, A., Les Cobles de Jacme, Pere i Arnau March Madrid, Armengot. 10 ptas.
- PÉREZ DE URBEL, J., Los Monjes españoles en la Edad Media, 2 vols. Madrid, Inst. de Valencia de D. Juan. 40 ptas.
- Poesía española: antología, I, ed. D. Alonso. Madrid, Signo
- PUYOL, J., Crónica incompleta de los Reyes Católicos, 1469-76. Madrid, Archivos. 30 ptas.

- SAMPOGNARO, V, Causas geográficas de la Guerra del Chaco. Jena, Gronau. 80 Pf.
- SÁNCHEZ PÉREZ, J A, Alfonso X el Sabio Madrid, Bolaños y Aguilar 6 ptas
- SANTOVENIA, E S, Bolívar y las Antillas hispanas. Madrid, Espasa-Calpe 5 ptas
- SANTULLANO, L, Místicos españoles (Bibl del Estudiante, 18) Madrid, Archivos 4 ptas
- SUREDA BLANES, F, El Beato Ramón Lull Palma, Politécnica 30 ptas
- VALERA, J, Obras (omnibus). Madrid, Bolaños y Aguilar 60 ptas
- VASSAL-REIG, C, Richelieu et la Catalogne. Paris, Occitania. 22 fr.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, Caballero de Olmedo Paris, Belles Lettres 8 fr.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, Comendadores de Córdoba, ed. Blanco (Bibl. Universal, 191). Madrid, Hernando. 0 75 pta.
- VEGA, LOPE DE, Dorotea, ed. E Juhà, 2 vols (Bibl Universal, 189-190). Madrid, Hernando 1 pta. 50.
- VERA, F, Los Historiadores de la matemática española. Madrid, Góngora. 4 ptas
- VERGARA, M. A., Los Orígenes de Jujuy, 1535-1600. Buenos Aires, López. 7 ptas. 50.
- VILLAGUTIÉRREZ, J DE, Historia de la conquista de la provincia de El Itza (Bibl Goathemala, IX). Guatemala, Tip Nacional.

### Portuguese.

- CASTRO E ALMEIDA, VIRGINIA DE, Chroniques de Gomes Eannes de Azurara. Paris, Duchartre. 25 fr.
- CASTRO E ALMEIDA, VIRGINIA DE, Vie de Luis de Camoens. Paris, Duchartre. 25 fr
- DESCAMPS, P., Portugal: la vie sociale actuelle. Paris, Firmin-Didot. 30 fr.
- LE GENTIL, G., La Littérature portugaise. Paris, Cohn. 10 fr 50.
- NORMANO, J F, Brazil, a study of economic types. Univ. of North Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses 13s. 6d.
- RIBEIRO, M DE SAMPAYO, Damião de Goes na livraria real da música Lisbon, Beleza

### Rumanian, Rhætoromance.

- ORTIZ, R., Lineamenti di una interpretazione critica della corrente italianista in Rumania. Padua, Soc. Coop. Tip.
- ORTIZ, R., Per la Storia dei contatti ispano-rumeni, 1710-1932 Florence, Olschki.

### French, Provençal.

(Place of publication is Paris, unless otherwise stated.)

#### (a) General (including Linguistic).

- ALBRECHTS, W., Bezeichnungen von Kraftwagen und Kraftwagen-Bestandteilen im Französischen. Diss. Hamburg, Hay.
- BENNEFELD, H., Der nominale Ausdruck des Besitzverhältnisses im Französischen. Diss. Bochum-Langendreer, Pöppinghaus.
- BRUNOT, F., Histoire de la langue française, VIII, 2-3. Cohn. 60 fr.
- BUCKENMAYER, A., Die Mundart von Camarès (Aveyron). Diss. Tübingen, Gobel.
- CHAPUY, P. Origines des noms patronymiques français. Dorbon-Ainé. 60 fr.
- DENGLER, B., Die Mundart von St Vincent de Tyrosse und Umgebung (Landes). Diss Tübingen, Gobel.

- DILL, W, Die Wortstellung in den Cent Nouvelles Nouvelles Diss Bochum-Langendieer, Poppinghaus.
- GÉRARD, R, Notes sur un prieuré bénédictin de la route des pèlerinages · Saint-Gilles de Montoire (XI<sup>e</sup> siècle). Éditions d'Art et d'Histoire
- HEYN, E, Der Wandel von voitongen  $e > i$  im Altfranzosischen. Diss Borna-Leipzig, Noske
- JACOBET, H, Variétés d'histoire littéraire, de méthodologie et de critique d'humeur Belles Lettres 15 fr.
- LE BIDOIS, G et R, Syntaxe du français moderne, 1 Picard 60 fr
- POPPE, E, Die Sprache Gilles de Gouberville's und ihre Beziehungen zu den modernen normannischen Mundarten Diss Leipzig, Vogel
- ROHE, A, Die Terminologie der Fischersprache von Gran d'Agde (Hérault) Diss. Tübingen
- SAINÉAN, L, Autour des sources indigènes, étude d'étymologie française et romane (Bibl dell' AR, II, 20) Florence, Olschki L 150
- SAINTYVES, P, Corpus de folklore préhistorique en France et dans les colonies françaises, 2 vols. Nourry. 140 fr
- SENGER, MARIA, Französische Grussformeln Diss. Lippstadt, Blomske.

(b) *Old French.*

- Chanson de Roland, ed Bertoni Florence, Olschki. L. 40
- CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES, Der Percevalroman (Li Contes del Graal). In Auswahl herausg. von A. Hilka (Sammlung romanischer Übungstexte) Halle, Niemeyer 3 M. 40
- DROZ, EUGÉNIE, Le Recueil Trepperel: les Sotties. Droz. 80 fr
- FISCHER, P., Die französische Übersetzung des Pseudo-Turpin nach dem Codex Gallicus 52 (München) (Pseudo-Turpin Studien, 3) Würzburg, Roman. Seminar.
- FRESE, F., Allegorische und mythologische Gestalten in den Dichtungen Eustache Deschamps Diss Bottrop i.W., Postberg
- FÜRST, N., Versuch einer geographischen Literaturgeschichte Frankreichs, 1000–1550. Diss. Munich, Salesian. Offizin.
- HOEFFNER, E, Les Lais de Marie de France. Boivin. 15 fr.
- LIFSCHITZ-GOLDEN, M, Les Juifs dans la Littérature française du Moyen Âge. New York, Institute of French Studies \$2 25
- PLATH, K, Der Typ des Verraters in den älteren Chansons de Geste. Diss. Bleicherode a H, Nieft.
- PYRAMUS, D., La vie Saint Edmund le roi, ed H Kjellman Goteborg, Wettergren and Kerber. Kr 10
- SCHMITT, R., Der Pseudo-Turpin Harley 273 (Pseudo-Turpin Studien, 4). Würzburg, Roman. Seminar

(c) *Modern French.*

- (Academy.) Trois siècles de l'Académie Française Firmin-Didot. 25 fr.
- ALAIN, Stendhal (Maîtres des Littératures). Rieder. 16 fr. 50.
- BALDANZI, R. E., Il Pensiero religioso di G. G. Rousseau. Florence, Le Monnier. L 15.
- BALZAC, La Comédie humaine, 2 vols. (Pléiade). NRF. 136 fr.
- BALZAC, Les Chouans, 2 vols. (Génie de la France). NRF. 10 fr.
- BARBOU, A., La Vie de Victor Hugo. Fasquelle 15 fr.
- BARZEL, C., Coups de soleil: artistes et écrivains d'aujourd'hui. Messen. 15 fr.
- BASKERVILLE, C. R, Pierre Gringoire's pageants for the entry of Mary Tudor into Paris. Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 7s.

- BERRET, P., La Légende des Siècles de Victor Hugo, étude et analyse Mellottée. 20 fr
- BILLESKOV JANSEN, F J., Sources vives de la pensée de Montaigne. Alcan. 18 fr
- BOSSUET, Oraisons funèbres (Génie de la France) NRF. 5 fr.
- CAPASSO, A., Marcel Proust Milan, Dante Alighieri L 30.
- CARTWRIGHT, FRANÇOISE, Amerikanische Gedanken in den literarischen Werken Maeterlincks Diss Landau, Rheinpf
- CARTWRIGHT, FR D., Maurice Maeterlinck und Amerika Berlin, Collignon 2 M
- CÉ, C., Regards sur l'œuvre d'Édouard Estaunié Perrin. 12 fr.
- CHARPENTIER, J., Napoléon et les hommes de lettres de son temps Mercure 15 fr
- CHATEAUBRIAND, René, éd. crit. A Weil. Droz. 24 fr
- DAYRAY, J., George Sand et ses amants Michel. 15 fr
- DELAHAYE, E., La Part de Verlaine et Rimbaud dans le sentiment religieux contemporain Messein 9 fr
- DÉRIEUX, H., La Poésie française contemporaine, 1885-1935 Mercure 15 fr
- DESCARTES, Lettres sur la morale Boivin 30 fr
- DIDEROT, Œuvres complètes, 1 vol. (Pléiade) NRF 68 fr.
- DIMIER, L., Le Nationalisme littéraire et ses méfaits chez les français Corrêa 12 fr
- DONNAY, M., Musset et l'amour (Hier et Aujourd'hui) Flammarion. 3 fr 75.
- DRAULT, J., Drumont la France juive et la Libre Parole. Malfère 18 fr.
- ENSTE, E., Stendhal als Schilderer der Sitten seiner Zeit Diss. Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus
- ESCHOLIER, R., Victor Hugo et les femmes (Hier et Aujourd'hui). Flammarion. 3 fr 75
- EVANS, S., Leur Jeunesse Michelet, Renan, Taine. Rev mod des Arts et de la Vie 12 fr.
- FAHMY, DORRYA, Charles Poncey, poète maçon, 1821-91 Presses Universitaires. 20 fr
- FAHMY, DORRYA, George Sand, auteur dramatique. Droz 50 fr.
- FLAUBERT, Correspondance, I. 1830-35. Fasquelle. 12 fr
- FRASER, I. F., Bibliography of French-Canadian Poetry, Part I New York, Institute of French Studies \$1 25.
- FRAZER, LYDIA, La Bretagne de Charles Le Goffic. Malfère. 15 fr.
- FRETS, HUBERTA, L'Élément germanique dans l'œuvre d'Émile Verhaeren (Bibl. RLC. 106). Champion. 40 fr
- FRIEDERICH, H., Das antiromantische Denken im modernen Frankreich (Munchener roman Arb, 4) Munich, Hueber. 12 M 50.
- FUMET, S., La Mission de Léon Bloy. Desclée de Brouwer 20 fr.
- GANSS, HILDEGARDE, Francis Jammes in seinem Verhältnis zur Antike. Diss. Quakenbrück.
- GESCHKE, MILA, Jules Michelets Frauenideal. Diss Wurzburg, Mayr.
- (GIDE). André Gide et nos temps: entretien. NRF. 5 fr.
- GIDE, Œuvres complètes, VIII. 1914-17. NRF. 75 fr
- GOHIN, F., Les Comédies attribuées à La Fontaine: Le Florentin (Bibl. d'Hist. litt et de Critique) Garnier. 10 fr.
- GRAUX, DR L., Les Fractures de la Dame aux Camélias. Ficker 30 fr
- HAMELIN, J., Victor Hugo, avocat. Hachette 8 fr.
- HANOTAUX, G., Raymond Poincaré. Plon. 7 fr. 50.

- HOFMANN, MARIANNE, *Der Moralist André Gide* Diss Wurzburg, Mayr  
(HUGO) Victor Hugo *Arts et Métiers graphiques* 35 fr.  
(HUGO) Victor Hugo *Rieder* 10 fr  
(HUGO) *Les Plaidoiries de Victor Hugo*, pref F Payen Hachette 8 fr.  
HUGO, *Œuvres complètes*, éd. définitive Hetzel Fasquelle 82 vols at 7 fr 50  
IMBART DE LA TOUR, P, Calvin *L'Institution chrétienne* Firmin-Didot 25 fr  
KIRCHHOFF, H W, *Selbstdarstellung bei Anatole France* Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus.  
KNELL, MARIANNE, *Charles Péguy und seine Bedeutung für die geistigen Erneuerung Frankreichs* Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus  
LAQUERRIÈRE, A L, et J BOLLERY, *Bibliothéconographie de Léon Bloy* La Connaissance 30 fr.  
LARGUIER, L *Victor Hugo en vingt images* Michel 15 fr  
LESAGE, *Histoire de Gil Blas de Santillane*, ed A. Dupouy Belles Lettres. 60 fr.  
LEVIS MIREPOIX, DUC DE, *Saint-Simon* Éd de France 20 fr  
LINSSENMAIER, W, *Die Darstellung des Menschen in Georges Duhamels Roman 'Deux Hommes'*. Diss Wurzburg, Werkbund-Druckerei  
LOTE, G, *En préface à Hernani: cent ans après* Droz. 20 fr  
LUGLI, V, *Montaigne* Lanciano, Carabba L 8  
MABILLE DE PONCHEVILLE, B, *Scènes et tableaux de la Restauration* Gautier-Languereau 12 fr  
MAUCLAIR, C, *Mallarmé chez lui* Grasset 12 fr  
MAUROIS, A, *Voltaire* NRF 32 fr.  
MAURRAS, C., *Louis XIV et la France* Cadran 80 fr.  
MÉRIMÉE, *Chronique du règne de Charles IX (Géne de la France)*. NRF. 5 fr.  
MILLÉQUANT, P, *Tableau de la littérature française du romantisme à nos jours*. Berlin-Schoneberg, Langenscheidt. 3 M 75.  
MONTAIGNE, *Œuvres complètes*, x. *Théologie naturelle de R Sebon*. Conard 30 fr  
PLATTARD, J, *État présent des études sur Montaigne* Belles Lettres. 6 fr.  
RONCARD, *Les Hymnes de 1555, le second livre des hymnes de 1556 (Œuvres complètes, VIII)*. Droz 40 fr  
ROSENBAUM, RUTH, *Die Natur in der Lyrik Verhaerens*. Diss. Borna-Leipzig, Noske.  
RUDLER, G, *Adolphe, de Benjamin Constant (Les Grands Événements littéraires, 51)*. Malfère 12 fr.  
SAINT-RENÉ, M, *Les Visages de l'amour dans l'œuvre de Victor Hugo*. Éd. Études Poétiques. 15 fr.  
SARDOU, V, *Théâtre complet*, iv Michel 20 fr  
SCHILLING, IDA, *Frauentypen in den Dramen von Henry Becque* Diss. Wertheim a.M., Bechstein.  
SCHMÖCKEL, GERDA, *Die Belebtheit des Stils in der Darstellungsart des Jules Verne*. Diss Bresslau, Maruschke und Behrendt  
SCHROER, CHARLOTTE, *Les petits Poèmes en prose von Baudelaire (Leipzig. roman Studien, II, 3)* Leipzig, Roman. Seminar 3 M.  
SÉE, H., et A RÉBILLON, *Le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle (Clio, VI)* Presses Universitaires 35 fr.  
SEILLIÈRE, E, *Jules Lemaitre* NRC. 15 fr.  
SERPEL, D. R, *The Condition of Protestantism in France, 1650-54*. Toulouse, Privat  
SOREL, J. A, *Scènes et tableaux du Consulat et de l'Empire*. Gautier-Languereau 12 fr.



- STAEL, MME DE, De la littérature. De l'Allemagne, ed Feuilletie Larousse. 1 fr 50
- STIELER, ELISABETH, Zolas Stellung zu Religion und Kirche Diss Bochum-Langendreer, Poppinghaus (Arb z roman Phil, Munster, 21)
- STOLLE, H, Das Komische bei Godinet Diss Rostock, Beckmann
- STRIEGLER, Philéas Lebesgue, ein Dichter der Pikardie. Bottrop, Postberg
- THIÉBAUT, M, Évasions littéraires (Giraudoux, Valéry-Larbaud, Durtain, Taine Jacquemont, Chateaubriand, Restif de la Bretonne) NRF. 15 fr.
- TRUDGIAN, HELEN, L'Esthétique de J-K Huysmans. Conard. 50 fr
- VANWELKENHUYSEN, G, J-K. Huysmans et la Belgique. Mercure 12 fr
- VILLEY, P, Montaigne devant la postérité (Bibl RCC). Boivin. 24 fr
- WEISS, K, Die Landschaftsschilderung bei André Theuriot. Diss Rostock, Beckmann
- WOLFE, H, Ronsard and French Romantic Poetry (Zaharoff Lecture). Oxford, Univ Press 2s.

(d) *Provençal.*

- CAVALIERE, A, Le Poesie di Peire Raimon de Tolosa (Bibl. dell' AR, I, 22). Florence, Olschki L. 50.

## GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

**Scandinavian.**

- ARNTZ, H, Handbuch der Runenkunde (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte). Halle, M Niemeyer 14 M.
- Bandamannasaga med Oddsthatt, etc., ed. F Jónsson (Samfund til Udg af Gammel Nord. Litt ).
- HERMANNSSON, H., Icelandic Illuminated Manuscripts of the Middle Ages (Corpus Codicum Islandicorum medii aevi, 7). £11; half vellum £12. 10s

**English.**(a) *General (including Linguistic)*

- Catalogue of Specimens of Printing Types by English and Scottish Printers and Founders, 1665-1830 Compiled by W. Turner Berry and A. F. Johnson; Introduction by Stanley Morison. Oxford, Univ. Press; London, H Milford. 42s.
- CLARK, G N., The Dutch Influence on the English Vocabulary (S P.E. Tract, xlv). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1s 6d.
- Dictionary of American Biography, ed. by D. Malone. Vol. xv, Platt-Roberdeau. Oxford, Univ. Press, London, H. Milford. 52s 6d
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, xx. Collected by George Cookson Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s 6d
- PAGET, R., This English. London, Kegan Paul 4s. 6d.
- SERGEANTSON, M. S, A History of Foreign Words in English. London, Kegan Paul. 21s.
- Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of the Charles University, Prague, v. Prague, Charles University; London, Williams and Norgate. Cena Kč 36.
- Year's Work in English Studies, The, xiv, 1933. Ed. by F. S. Boas and M. S. Serjeantson. Oxford, Univ. Press 10s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- Anonymous Short English Metrical Chronicle, An, ed. by E Zetzl (E.E.T.S., 196). London, H. Milford. 20s.

- Quatrefoil of Love, The, ed by Sir I Gollancz and M. M Weale (E E T S , 195)  
London, H Milford 5s.
- SUSSKAND, P, Geschichte des unbestimmten Artikels im Alt- und Fruhmittel-  
englischen (Stud zur engl Phil, lxxxv) Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M
- WARDALE, E E., Chapters on Old English Literature. London, Kegan Paul  
8s 6d
- WILLARD, R , Two Apocrypha in Old English Homilies (Beitr zur engl Phil ,  
xxx) Leipzig, Tauchnitz. 8 M.

(c) *Modern English*

- BAESECKE, ANNA, Das Schauspiel der englischen Komodianten in Deutschland  
(Stud zur engl. Phil., lxxxvii) Halle, Niemeyer 6 M 50.
- BAKER, E A., The History of the English Novel Vol. vi Edgeworth, Austen,  
Scott. London, Witherby 16s.
- The Battle of Nieuport, 1600, ed by D. C Collins (Shakespeare Assoc. Facsimiles,  
9) London, H. Milford 6s
- BUCKMINSTER, T , An Almanack and Prognostication for the Year 1598, ed. by  
E. F. Bosanquet (Shakespeare Assoc. Facsimiles, 8). London, H Milford.  
6s.
- CALVERT, W. J , Byron · Romantic Paradox Univ. of North Carolina and Oxford  
Univ Presses. 11s. 6d.
- CECIL, LORD D., Jane Austen (Leshe Stephen Lecture) Cambridge, Univ. Press.  
1s. 6d.
- CHAMBERS, R. W , Thomas More. London, Cape. 12s 6d.
- CLARK, A M , Autobiography: Its Genesis and Phases Edinburgh and London,  
Oliver and Boyd. 2s. 6d
- CLARK, C., Falstaff and his Friends. Shrewsbury, Wilding. 5s.
- CROSFIELD, THOMAS, The Diary of, ed by F. S. Boas. London, H. Milford.  
12s 6d.
- DUKE, A , The Larke, ed by G Tillotson London, English Dept. University  
College. 1s.
- ELTON, O , The Nature of Literary Criticism. Manchester, Univ Press. 1s. 6d.
- English Plays, 1660–1820, ed by A E Morgan. New York, Harper. 16s.
- HILL, C J , The Literary Career of Richard Graves. Northampton, Mass., Smith  
College \$2.25
- KORN, M A., Die Weltanschauung Jonathan Swifts (Forschungen zur engl. Phil.,  
iv) Jena, Frommann. 6 M. 75
- KRONER, J., Die Technik des realistischen Dramas bei Ibsen und Galsworthy  
(Beitr. zur engl Phil , xxviii). Leipzig, Tauchnitz 6 M.
- LAW, MARIE H., The English Familiar Essay in the Early Nineteenth Century  
(Univ of Pennsylvania Thesis).
- LONGAKER, M., Contemporary Biography Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ  
Presses, London, H. Milford. 11s. 6d.
- MASON, J. E., Gentlefolk in the Making. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ.  
Presses; London, H Milford 18s.
- MATTICK, H., H. G. Wells als Sozialreformer (Beitr zur engl. Phil., xxix) Leipzig,  
Tauchnitz. 9 M.
- MILTON, J., Works. Vol. xi. Ed by F A Patterson and others Columbia and  
Oxford Univ. Presses; London, H Milford. 18 vols , £24.
- MOORE, J. R., Daniel Defoe and Modern Economic Theory. Bloomington, Univ.  
of Indiana. \$ 0 75.
- PARROTT, T. M., William Shakespeare: A Handbook. Oxford, Univ. Press;  
London, H. Milford. 6s.

- PEYRE, H, *Shelley et la France* Cairo, P Barbey  
 PINTO, V DE SOLA, Rochester London, Lane 8s. 6d  
 POLLOCK, J H, William Butler Yeats London, Duckworth 2s 6d  
 Ratsey, Gamahel, *The Life and Death of, and Ratseys Ghost*, ed by S H Atkins.  
 (Shakespeare Assoc Facsimiles, 10) London, H Milford 6s  
 READE, A R, *Main Currents in Modern Literature* London, Nicholson and  
 Watson 4s 6d  
 ROBERTS, S C, *Doctor Johnson*. London, Duckworth 2s  
 ROUTH, H V, *Money, Morals and Manners as Revealed in Modern Literature*  
 London, Nicholson and Watson 4s 6d  
 SARGENT, R M, *At the Court of Queen Elizabeth. The Life and Lyrics of Sir*  
*Edward Dyer* Oxford, Univ. Press, London, H Milford 10s 6d.  
 SCHUCKING, L L, *Der Sinn des Hamlet* Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer. 3 M. 40.  
 SHARPE, R B, *The Real War of the Theaters* Boston, D. C Heath, London,  
 H Milford 11s 6d  
 SMOLLETT, T, *An Essay on the External Use of Water*, ed with Introduction and  
 Notes by C J Jones Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press; London, H.  
 Milford 4s 6d  
 SPERRY, W L, *Wordsworth's Anti-Chmax* Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses,  
 London, H Milford 10s 6d  
 STOLL, E E, *Hamlet the Man* (English Assoc Pamphlet, 91) London, H  
 Milford. 2s 6d  
 STRAUMANN, H *Newspaper Headlines* London, Allen and Unwin. 10s.  
 SUMMERS, M, *A Bibliography of the Restoration Drama* London, Fortune Press.  
 15s.  
 TENNEY, E A., Thomas Lodge Cornell and Oxford Univ Presses; London, H.  
 Milford. 9s.  
 Traherne, T, *Felicities of*, ed. with an Introduction by Sir A. Quiller-Couch  
 London, Dobell. 3s  
 VIGLIONE, F., *La Critica Letteraria di Henry W. Longfellow*. 2 vols. Firenze,  
 Vallecchi 20 L.  
 ZINK, H. R., *Emerson's Use of the Bible* Lincoln, Neb., Univ. of Nebraska Press

### German.

#### (a) *General (including Linguistic).*

- BORCHLING, G., *Plattdeutsche Rechtschreibungslehre für die Mundarten des*  
*nordniedersächsischen Raumes* Hamburg. 1 M  
 DAHLBERG, TORSTEN, *Die Mundart von Dorste. Studien über die niederdeutschen*  
*Mundarten an der oberen Leine, Teil I. Die Vokale.* Copenhagen, Levin  
 and Munksgaard.  
 Der grosse Duden III, *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, bearb. von Otto  
 Basler. Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig 4 M.  
 NORDEN, EDUARD *Altgermanien. Völker- und namengeschichtliche Unter-*  
*suchungen.* Leipzig. 14 M.  
 RASTEDE, K., *Das Eindringen der hochdeutschen Schriftsprache in Oldenburg, in*  
*Oldenburger Jahrbuch des Vereins für Landesgeschichte, Bd. 38*  
 SCHWARZ, E., *Sudetendeutsche Sprachräume* (Schriften der Dt. Akad. in München,  
 21). Munich 10 M.  
 TEUCHERT, H., *Niederdeutsche Mundarten, Texte aus alter und neuer Zeit*  
*(Volkskundliche Texte, 4).* Leipzig. 3 M. 20.

(b) *Old and Middle High German.*

- Ecbasis curusdam captivi per tropologiam, hrsg von K. Strecker (Scriptores rerum german.). 3 M.
- Heland Anhang zu Heland, hrsg von E Sievers, besorgt von E. Schroder (Germanist Hdbibl 4) 1 M 50 (A reprint of Sievers' edition embodying this supplement is available for 5 M.)
- Mulhauser Reichsrechtsbuch, Das, hrsg von Herbert Meyer, 2. Ausg. Weimar. 6 M
- Orendel, hrsg von H. Steinger (Altdeutsche Textbibl. 36). Halle, Niemeyer 4 M 40
- SCHARMANN, TH., Studien über d. Sælde in d. ritterlichen Dichtung d. XII. und XIII. Jahrhunderts. 3 M.
- TORNQUIST, NILS, Eine fruhmittelhochdeutsche Interlinearversion der Psalmen aus dem ehemaligen Benediktinerstifte Milstatt in Karnten. Copenhagen, Levin and Munksgaard. 16 Kr 50

(c) *Modern German.*

- ALTHER, E., Komik und Humor bei Friedrich Hebbel (Wege zur Dichtung, 18) Frauenfeld, Huber. 4 M 80.
- Aurora Ein romantischer Almanach. Jahresgabe der deutschen Eichendorff-Stiftung. Begr. von Karl Fhr. von Eichendorff. Hrsg. von K. Sezodrok. 5 Oppeln, der Oberschlesier. 3 M
- BERGER, A. E., Die Schaubühne im Dienste der Reformation, T. 1 (Deutsche Literatur. Reihe 9, Reformation, Bd. 5) Leipzig, Reclam. 8 M. Lw. 9 M 50.
- BERTRAM, EL., Deutsche Gestalten. Fest- und Gedenkreden, 2. Aufl. Leipzig, Insel. 6 M.
- BING, S., Die Nachahmungstheorie bei Gottsched und den Schweizern und ihre Beziehung zu der Dichtungstheorie der Zeit. Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M.
- BRUGGEMANN, F., Gottscheds Lebens- und Kunstreform in den zwanziger und dreissiger Jahren. Gottsched, Breitingen, die Gottschedin, die Neuberin. (Deutsche Literatur. Reihe 14, Aufklärung, Bd. 3) Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50. Lw. 9 M.
- BRUNNER, H., Die Wissenschaftsphilosophie Fichtes (Nürnberg. Beiträge zu den Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften). Nürnberg, Kriese. 2 M. 60.
- CYSARZ, H., Dichtung im Daseinskampf. 5 Vorträge. Karlsbad, Kraft. 2 M 20. Lw. 3 M. 70.
- DENEKE, O., Robinson Crusoe in Deutschland. Die Frühdrucke 1720-1780 (Göttingische Nebenstunden, 11) Göttingen, Deneke. 2 M.
- DEUBEL, W., Der deutsche Weg zur Tragödie. Dresden, Jess. 2 M.
- Die Schwabischen Dichter. Zum Ehrentag der schwabischen Dichtung, hrsg. von A. Lammle ("Württemberg", Sonderh.). Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 1 M.
- DOMES, F. J., Schiller auf der dänischen Bühne. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 M.
- Eckart, Dietrich, ein Vermächtnis. Hrsg. von A. Rosenberg. 2. Aufl. München, Eher. 4 M.
- EGGERT, W., Christian Weise und seine Bühne (Germanisch und Deutsch, 9). Berlin, de Gruyter. 18 M.
- EURINGER, R., Dietrich Eckart, Leben eines deutschen Dichters. Hamburg, Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt. 1 M.
- FARBER. Unbekannte Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Goethekreis. Aus dem Nachlass Johann Michael Farbers. Hrsg. von H. Knuttermeyer (Abhandlungen und Vorträge der Bremer Wissen. Gesellschaft. Jg. 7, H. 3/4.) Bremen, Geist. 3 M.

- FORSSMANN, J., J. K. Lavater und die religiösen Stromungen des 18. Jahrhunderts (Abhandlungen des Herder-Instituts zu Riga, Bd 5, Nr 2). Riga, Plates 10 M
- Gedichte, Deutsche, hrsg von der Deutschen Akademie, München (2. P. Gerhart, 3 A Gryphius, 4. Angelus Silesius, 8 Claudius, 14/15. Holderlin, 16 Novalis, 22. Platen 26 Morike, 27 Hebbel, 29. Keller, 32 Nietzsche, 33 Lihencron) Each 40 Pf
- GRILLPARZER, F, Samthche Werke. Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe Hrsg von A. Sauer, fortgef. von R. Backmann Abt 3, Bd 4 Wien, Schroll 12 M Hlw 15 M.
- GRIMM Briefwechsel der Bruder Grimm mit Fr Zarnke Hrsg und erl von A. Litzmann (Sitzungsber. der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil-hist Kl, 1934, 28) Berlin, de Gruyter 3 M 50.
- GUNTHER, J. C, Samthche Werke Hist-krit Gesamtausgabe Hrsg von W. Kramer. Bd 4. (Bibliothek des Lit. Vereins Stuttgart, Sitz Tübingen, 283) Leipzig, Hiersemann 12 M
- HEILBORN, E., Deutschlandreisen in alter Zeit. Frankfurt, Societatsverlag. 5 M 40
- Hochstift, Freies Deutsches Im Auftrag der Verwaltung hrsg. von E. Beutler Halle, Niemeyer 3 M 20.
- HOEFERT, F K., Das Ehrenmal der gefallenen Dichter. Berlin, Traditions-Verlag. 4 M. 80.
- HOFFMANN, K. E., Das Leben des Dichters Heinrich Leuthold. Basel, Schwabe. 4 M.
- HUSCHKE, K., Lenau und die Musik. Regensburg, Bosse. 1 M. 80.
- Jahrbuch für Volksliedforschung. Im Auftrag des Deutschen Volksliedarchivs hrsg von J Meier. Jg. 4. Berlin, de Gruyter. 10 M Lw. 11 M. 50.
- Jahrbuch der Schopenhauer-Gesellschaft, 22 Heidelberg, Winter. 11 M.
- JEAN PAUL. Sämtliche Werke. Hist-krit. Ausgabe. Abt. 2, Nachlass. Bd. 4. Weimar, Bohlau. Subskr.-Pr. 20 M. 60, geb. 26 M.
- JENNY, E., Die Heimatskunstbewegung. Ein Beitrag zur neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte. Basel, Philograph Verlag. 5 Fr 40
- JENSSEN, C., Hans Friedrich Blunck. Leben und Werk. Berlin, Buch- und Tiefdruck G m b H. 2 M. 90.
- JUNGSMANN, O, Kaspar Hauser Stoff und Problem in ihrer literarischen Gestaltung. Würzburg, Triltsch. 3 M.
- KINAU, J, Gorch Fock. Ein Leben im Banne der See. München, Lehmann 5 M 50.
- KINDERMANN, H., Von deutscher Art und Kunst (Deutsche Literatur. Reihe 5, Irrationalismus. Bd. 6). Leipzig, Reclam. 8 M. 20. Lw. 9 M. 80.
- KIRSCHFELDT, J, Herders Konsistoralexamen in Riga im Jahre 1767 (Abhandlungen des Riga-Instituts zu Riga, Bd. 5, Nr. 5). Riga, Plates. 1 M. 20.
- KORNER, H, Studien zur geistesgeschichtlichen Stellung Sebastian Francks. Breslau, Marcus. 5 M. 20.
- LANGENBUCHER, H., Nationalsozialistische Dichtung Einführung und Übersicht Berlin, Junker und Dunnhaupt. 1 M.
- LAUSKNER, R., Der gespielte Faust. Goethes Faust, 2. Teil (Bucherei für Spiel und Theater, 2.) Berlin, Langen/Müller. 3 M. 20.
- LECHER, H, Kleine Literaturgeschichte des deutschen Sprachraumes. Innsbruck, Tyrolia. 3 M. 20.
- LESSING, G E., Werke, hrsg. von J. Petersen und W. von Olshausen. Bd. 24, 25. (Bongs Goldene Klassiker-Bibliothek.) Berlin, Bong. 5 M. 40 each.

- LINDEN, W., Heinrich von Kleist, der Dichter der volkischen Gemeinschaft  
Leipzig, Reclam 75 Pf.
- LOHDE, W., Schiller, ein deutscher Revolutionär. München, Ludendorff  
30 Pf
- LUDWIG, O., Otto Ludwig-Kalender Jahrbuch des Otto Ludwig-Vereins. Hrsg.  
von W. Greiner Jahrgang 7, 1935. Weimar, Bohlau 2 M
- LUTHER, M., Ausgewählte Werke Hrsg. von H. H. Borchardt. 2. veränd. Aufl.  
bes. von G. Merz. Erg.-Reihe Bd 1. München, Kaiser. 4 M. 80
- LUTHER, M., Die Lutherbibel Festschrift zum 400-jährigen Jubiläum der  
Lutherbibel mit Vorwort von E. Zweynert und Beiträgen von A. Risch u. a.  
Stuttgart, Steinkopf. 2 M. 80.
- MASKOW, E., Theodor Schwarz Ein pommerscher Romantiker (Pommern-  
forschung Reihe 3, H. 1) Greifswald, Bamberg 3 M.
- MAY, F., Neue deutsche Literaturgeschichte Bd. 2. Leipzig, Nationale Verlags-  
gesellschaft. 3 M 50 Lw. 5 M
- MEIER, J., Balladen T 1. (Deutsche Literatur. Reihe 10, Das deutsche Volks-  
lied Bd. 1) Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M. 50. Lw. 9 M.
- MULLER, H. R., Rainer Maria Rilke als Mystiker (Furche-Studien, 11). Berlin,  
Furche-Verlag 5 M. 80
- NOLLAU, A., Das literarische Publikum des jungen Goethe von 1770 bis zur  
Übersiedlung nach Weimar (Literatur und Leben, 5). Weimar, Bohlau  
5 M.
- OBENAUER, K. J. (ed.), Innere Form und dichterische Phantasie. Zwei Vorstudien  
zu einer neuen deutschen Poetik von R. Schwingen und H. Nicolai.  
München, Beck. 7 M. 50.
- PAULS, V., Klaus Groth und Emil Kuhs Hebbel-Biographie Jahrgabe der  
Hebbelgemeinde. Heide, Heider Anzeiger.
- PETERSEN, J., Das Todesproblem bei Rainer Maria Rilke (Diss. Frankfurt).  
Würzburg, Tritsch. 2 M.
- PFEILSCHIFFER, G., Friedrich Nicolaus Briefwechsel mit St. Blasien (Sitzungs-  
berichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist.  
Abteilung Jg 1935, H. 2). München, Beck. 6 M.
- PONGS, H., Schillers Urbilder. Stuttgart, Metzler.
- RAABE, W., Mitteilungen für die Gesellschaft der Freunde Wilhelm Raabes.  
Jahrgang 25, 1
- RAYBOULD, E., Richard von Krahks Erneuerung altdeutscher Dichtung Wien,  
Osterr. Bundesverlag. 3 M.
- REITMEYER, E., Studien zum Problem der Gedichtsammlung mit eingehender  
Untersuchung der Gedichtsammlungen Goethes und Tiecks (Sprache und  
Dichtung, 57). Bern, Haupt. 6 M. 50.
- RICHTER, F., Otto Ludwigs Trauerspielplan "Tiberius Gracchus" und sein  
Zusammenhang mit den "Shakespeare-Studien" (Sprache und Kultur der  
germanischen und romanischen Völker. B. Bd. 12). Breslau, Priebatsch  
5 M. 40.
- ROBERTSON, J. G., Essays and Addresses on Literature. London, Routledge.  
12s. 6d.
- ROTHERMEL, O., Friedrich Schlegel und Fichte (Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen  
Philologie, 36). Giessen, Munchow. 2 M. 50.
- SCHIEFFEL, J. V., Vom Trompeter zum Ekkehard Briefe ins Elternhaus 1853/5.  
Hrsg. von W. Zentner. Karlsruhe. (Gabe des deutschen Scheffelbundes, 10.)
- SCHILLER, Fr. von. Dem Andenken Schillers Tientsin-Peiping. Peiyang Press.
- SCHMIDT, W., "Penthesilea" in der Kleistliteratur (Von deutscher Poesie, 16).  
Leipzig, Weber. 2 M. 80.

- SCHOPP, J, Das deutsche Arbeitslied (Germanische Bibliothek, II. Abt Untersuchungen und Texte, Bd 38) Heidelberg, Winter 18 M geb. 20 M 50.
- SCHULTZ, W, Das Verhältnis von Ich und Wirklichkeit in der religiösen Anthropologie Schleiermachers (Studien zur systematischen Theologie, 17) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 6 M 80
- STAIGER, E, Der Geist der Liebe und das Schicksal Schelling, Hegel, Holderlin (Wege zur Dichtung, 19 ) Frauenfeld, Huber 3 M 85
- THIMME, A., Georg Wigand und die Musenklänge aus Deutschlands Leierkasten (Göttingische Nebenstunden, 12) Göttingen, Deneke 2 M
- VOLKMANN, E, Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg 1914 bis 1918 (Deutsche Literatur Reihe 19, Politische Dichtung, Bd 8) Leipzig, Reclam. 7 M 50.
- VOSS, L, Goethes unsterbliche Freundin (Charlotte von Stein) 8/9. Bd, Braunschweig, Westermann. 3 M 50
- WALLER, M., Lessings Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts (Germanische Studien, 160). Berlin, Ebering 7 M. 80.
- WENDEL, V., Pegasus in Tabakwolken Leipzig, Hiersemann. 8 M.
- WITTE, A, Schiller und die Gegenwart (Jenaer Akademische Reden, 20) Jena Fischer. 1 M 10